DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 659 HE 018 653

AUTHOR	Kaston, Carren O.; Heffernan, James M.
TITLE	Preparing Humanists for Work: A National Study of Undergraduate Internships in the Humanities.
INSTITUTION	Washington Center, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	National Endowment for the Humanities (NFAH), Washington, DC. Office of Planning and Policy Assessment.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	84
NOTE	110p.; Additional funding was also provided by W. W. Norton and Company, Inc.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, 124 St. Mary's Street, Raleigh, NC 27605 ($8.00 plus $2.00 postage and handling.)
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	American Studies; Art History; Case Studies; *College Programs; Departments; English; Higher Education; History; *Humanities; *Internship Programs; Modern Languages; National Surveys; Philosophy; Private Colleges; Professional Associations; *Program Administration; Questionnaires; State Universities; Student Evaluation; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS	Boston University MA; Bowling Green State University OH; Brown University RI; Great Lakes College Association; Macalester College MN; Purdue University Calumet IN; Scripps College CA; Sweet Briar College VA; Washington Center DC; Wayne State University MI

ABSTRACT

Results of a national study of college student internships in the humanities are provided. The focus was attitudes and practices of 1,621 departments and central offices on U.S. campuses concerning internships in the following majors: English, American studies, history, art history, philosophy, classics, and modern foreign languages. Information about non-sponsors and sponsors of humanities internships was obtained, using two questionnaires, which are appended. The investigation also covered: prerequisites for students, internship placement, extra fees, paid internships, learning plans or contracts, hours students work, student evaluation and the fulfilling of academic requirements, evaluating student internship performance, grades, credit awarded, locating "high-quality" internships, and reasons for success in internship programs. Case studies cover ad hoc and department coordinated internships including: art history (Sweet Briar), modern foreign languages (Purdue), English (Wayne State), history (Boston University), philosophy (Bowling Green State); joint arrangements by department and office including Office of the Dean (Brown), Career Cevelopment Center/Internship Program (Macalester); institutionalized programs, e.g., humanities internship program (Scripps); and internship programs based outside the school, e.g., The Washington Center and the Philadelphia Urban Semester (Great Lakes College Association). (SW)

ED260659

PREPARING HUMANISTS FOR WORK:

A NATIONAL STUDY OF UNDERGRADUATE INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES

CARLTON E. BEAUDIN

AND

JAMES G. HEPBURN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Washington Center

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PREPARING HUMANISTS FOR WORK:

A NATIONAL STUDY OF UNDERGRADUATE INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES

Sponsored by
The National Endowment for the Humanities

with additional support from
The Rockefeller Foundation
and W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

by
Carren O. Kaston
with
James M. Heffernan

THE WASHINGTON CENTER

The research for this report was supported by the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment of the National Endowment for the Humanities, grant number OP-20141-83. Additional funding was provided by the Rockefeller Foundation and W.W. Norton and Company, Inc. The contents, however, are the responsibility of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the views of the sponsors.

© The Washington Center 1984

The Washington Center
1101 Fourteenth Street, Northwest
Twelfth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 289-8680

Ordering Information

Copies of *Preparing Humanists for Work: A National Study of Undergraduate Internships in the Humanities* (99 pp.) are available for $8.00 plus $2.00 postage and handling from:

The National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE)
124 St. Mary's Street
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605
(919) 834-7536

Copies of the *Directory of Undergraduate Internships in the Humanities* (c. 175 pp.) are available for $11.00 plus $1.00 postage and handling from:

The Modern Language Association of America (MLA)
Customer Services
62 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10011
(212) 741-7883

ABSTRACT

This is the first national study specifically of internships in the humanities. It provides information on the attitudes and practices of 1,621 departments and central offices on college and university campuses across the country with respect to internships for undergraduate majors in the humanities: English, American studies, history, art history, philosophy, classics and modern foreign languages. Respondents furnished data on why they provide humanities students with access to internships--or why they do not.

Highlights of the report include the findings that:

* Nearly a third of all baccalaureate-granting institutions have some form of internship activity in the humanities. (p. 5)
* Art history, American studies, history and English have the greatest involvement with internships; classics, philosophy and modern foreign languages have the least. (p. 5)
* The percentage of highly selective institutions sponsoring humanities internships is nearly double the percentage of selective institutions in the nation. (p. 8)
* Faculty whose departments do not sponsor internships point more often to resource limitations than to faculty attitudes to explain the lack of activity. (p. 12)
* A quarter of the responding faculty who do not sponsor internships are now interested in offering internship access to their majors. (p. 16)
* Nearly two thirds of those who sponsor internships established programs in the last ten years, one fourth of them since 1980. (p. 22)
* Vocational purposes are the rationale cited most often for providing internships in the humanities. (p. 23)
* Four fifths provide internships to humanities students through department-based programs. (p. 25)
* Most programs have no funds specifically allocated for internship activity. (p. 27)
* Most who sponsor internships receive no compensation for their involvement. (p. 29)
* Quality control and screening are typically exercised in controlling student access to internships. (p. 30)
* Among the large majority who assign grades for internships, the A-F scale is most popular. (p. 35)
* A large majority award credit for the internship, most of them credit in the major. (p. 36)
* A majority report that former interns are, in fact, more employable after graduation. (p. 23)

Contents

Abstract iii

List of Tables ix

Acknowledgements xi

INTRODUCTION 1

1. Survey Population 3

2. Response Rates and Representativeness of Responses 5

3. Additional Characteristics of the Sample 7

QUESTIONNAIRE A: THOSE WHO DO NOT SPONSOR INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES 10

1. Rationale for Not Sponsoring Internships 10

2. Internship Access Outside of the Department 13

3. Current Levels of Interest in Internships 14

Among students 14

Among faculty 16

Among institutions 18

4. Additional Comments 19

5. Summary 20

QUESTIONNAIRE B: THOSE WHO SPONSOR INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES 21

1. History and Rationale of Internship Programs 21

2. How Internships are Provided to Humanities Students 24

Structures through which students obtain access 25

Sources of funding for internship programs 27

Services provided to students 27

Special requirements for those who administer internships 28

Compensation for administering internships 28

The role of internships in promotion, tenure and merit pay 29

3. Student Process....29
Prerequisites for participating in internships....30
Internship placement: local, state, national, international....31
Extra fees....32
Internships for pay....32
Learning plans or contracts....33
Hours students work....33
4. Student Evaluation and the Fulfilling of Academic Requirements....34
Methods of evaluating student internship performance....34
Grades....35
Grades of "Incomplete"....35
Satisfaction of academic requirements....36
Credit awarded....36
5. Humanities Internships: An Overview....38
Ease and difficulty of finding "high-quality" internships....38
Defining a "high-quality" internship....39
Reasons for success in internship programs....41
Sources of difficulty in internship programs....44
Major internship issues in the humanities....47
6. Summary....51

CASE STUDIES

Introduction....54
A. Ad Hoc Departmental Internships
1. Art History, Sweet Briar College....56
2. Modern Foreign Languages, Purdue University-Calumet....58
B. Department-Coordinated Internships
3. English, Wayne State University....61
4. History, Boston University....63
5. Philosophy, Bowling Green State University....66

C. Joint Arrangements by Department and Campus Office

6. Office of the Dean, Brown University.....68

7. Career Development Center/Internship Program, Macalester College.....71

D. Institutionalized Internship Programs

8. Humanities Internship Program, Scripps College.....73

E. Internship Programs Based Outside of the School

9. The Washington Center.....77

10. The Great Lakes College Association Philadelphia Urban Semester.....80

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE.....83

Appendix A. Memoranda, Questionnaire A, Questionnaire B.....88

Appendix B. Table of Modern Foreign Languages: Frequency of "A's" and "B's".....99

List of Tables

1	Departments Surveyed at Institutions Across the Country	4
2	Usable Returns by Department/Office: Questionnaires A and B	6
3	Frequency of "A's" and "B's" in Sample--by Department	6
4	Institutional Type—Public vs. Private	7
5	Institutional Size—by Type	8
6-A	Rationale for Not Sponsoring Internships--Faculty Attitudes	11
6-B	Rationale for Not Sponsoring Internships--Resource Limitations	12
7	Basis of Current Student Interest in Internships	15
8	Basis of Current Faculty Interest in Internships	16
9	Basis of Current Institutional Action on Internships	18
10	Factors in the Decision to Offer Internships	22
11	Rationale for Sponsoring Internships	23
12	Structures through which Students Obtain Access	25
13	Internship Services	27
14	Prerequisites for Participation in Internships	30
15	Location of Internship Placements Relative to Home Institution	31
16	Methods of Evaluating Internships	34
17-A	Determining Internship Quality--Components	39
17-B	Determining Internship Quality--Results	40
18-A	Reasons for Success in Internship Programs--Components	41
18-B	Reasons for Success in Internship Programs--Results	43
19-A	Program Difficulties--Attitudes	44
19-B	Program Difficulties--Processes	45
19-C	Program Difficulties--Resource Limitations	46
20-A	Major Internship Issues--Attitudes	48
20-B	Major Internship Issues--Resources	48
20-C	Major Internship Issues--Process and Program Design	49
20-D	Major Internship Issues--The Philosophy of Internships	50

Acknowledgements

The completion and publication of this study are the result of a coalescence of vision on the part of various agencies and organizations in both the public and private sectors, each with this educational priority: the strengthening of humanities studies on college and university campuses across the nation. Susanne Garvey, Director of Program and Institutional Advancement at the Washington Center, originally conceived the project and secured funding for it at every step along the way. We were fortunate to have Arnita Jones and Jeff Thomas at the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment of the National Endowment for the Humanities working with us to make the guidelines of the NEH grant both clear and flexible. And we are especially grateful to the Rockefeller Foundation for additional funding that was indispensable to the completion of this report in its present form. A desire to enhance the well-being of studies in the humanities also motivated W.W. Norton and Company, Inc., publisher of textbooks in the humanities, to support the project. Finally, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the assistance of the Modern Language Association of America. The interest of Walter Achtert, Director of Book Publications and Research Programs at the MLA, has enabled us to bring the Directory of Undergraduate Internships in the Humanities, which is based upon this study and published under separate cover, to its many audiences in the humanities.

Frank J. Atelsek, Director of the Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education, generously provided descriptive data on the nation's institutions of higher learning, which enabled us to determine the representativeness of our sample. Coleen Walters and Chris Walters at the Washington Center provided invaluable assistance in readying this report for publication. The National Society for Internships and Experiential Education has graciously agreed to distribute the report for the Center.

Special thanks are due to all those who took the time to complete the questionnaires that formed the basis of this study. In particular, we would like to acknowledge the programs that have greatly enriched this final report by allowing the details of their internship activity to be presented in the case studies.

Not least, it is a pleasure to thank the members of this project's energetic and highly sophisticated Advisory Committee:

Dr. Jack Child
Department of Language
and Foreign Studies
The American University

Dr. Phyllis Franklin
Director
English Programs and
The Association of
Departments of English
The Modern Language Association

Dr. Linda Lear
History Department
George Washington University

Dr. Kathryn Mohrman
Associate Dean
Brown University

Dr. Sharon Rubin
Director
Experiential Learning Programs
University of Maryland

Dr. Carren O. Kaston
Project Director
NEH Study of Internships
in the Humanities
The Washington Center

Dr. James M. Heffernan
Executive Director
The Washington Center

INTRODUCTION

In October 1983, the Washington Center began work on a national survey and study of internships in the humanities, supported by a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The study is the first to focus specifically on internships in the humanities. The humanities were defined as English, American studies, history, art history, philosophy, classics, and modern foreign languages, the humanities disciplines most often offered as undergraduate majors. <1> Nearly 9,000 departments and central offices <2> at the nation's 2,006 baccalaureate-granting institutions were surveyed regarding why they provide humanities students with access to internships--or why they do not. This report provides information on the internship attitudes and practices of both groups. The audience for the report consists of educators, administrators and professionals concerned with the future of postsecondary humanities education in the United States, as well as faculty interested in implementing or improving undergraduate internships in the humanities.

Internships are structured, out-of-class learning experiences that include a substantial work component, and they may be taken either full-time, or part-time with concurrent course work. <3> Work experience gained as part of a teacher education or certification program is not included in the definition of an internship. Neither is assistance with a course or research performed to assist a professor in a department.

<1> In its current literature, the National Endowment for the Humanities says that study of the humanities encompasses "language; linguistics; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaeology; comparative religion; ethics; the history, criticism and theory of the arts; those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment, with particular attention to the relevance of the humanities to the current conditions of national life." Several considerations prompted us to narrow the focus of our study. First, the seven disciplines chosen already constituted a large survey population, close to 9,000, and included the greatest number of humanities undergraduates. In addition, certain social science fields, for example political science, were known to have a history of well-established internship activity. Fields such as studio art and theatre, which some include in the humanities, were excluded because the gap between classroom learning and practical experience is much more obviously and readily bridgeable than it is in the traditional humanities disciplines.

<2> Central on-campus offices include internship offices, experiential learning and cooperative education offices, deans' offices, and career planning and placement centers.

<3> While some internships may be paid, financial return is not their sole purpose, as it would be with a part-time or College Work-Study job.

Internships for undergraduates have been popular since the 1960's in certain fields with obvious connections to non-academic employment, for example, political science and journalism, but have been less well accepted by faculty in traditional humanities disciplines. According to returns from our sample, however, the 1970's and early 1980's saw explosive growth in internship activity in the humanities, despite a general return in the last few years to a more straightforward academic approach to education. Since 1975, the Washington Center, a nonprofit educational organization, has provided an academic internship program that places college juniors and seniors from around the country in government, business, cultural and public interest organizations in the nation's capital. Sensing that interest in internships in the humanities had grown, the Washington Center in 1982 enlisted the support of the MacArthur Foundation in incorporating a humanities component into its undergraduate internship program, and 15% of the Center's interns are now humanities students.

The increased interest among humanities faculty in work-and-learning experiences for their undergraduates has coincided with a severe decline in the employment opportunities formerly available to such students upon graduation. Concerned for the precarious position of humanities studies at colleges and universities nationwide, the Washington Center entered into discussions with the Office of Planning and Policy Assessment at the National Endowment for the Humanities about the kinds of access that humanities majors have to internships. It was felt that if humanities faculty could know what their peers elsewhere were offering undergraduates in the way of structured, supervised work experiences, they might possess an effective tool for strengthening the position of their own humanities programs. In providing additional funds to complete the project, the Rockefeller Foundation was moved by a similar concern for the position of the humanities in American life and higher education. One of the priorities of the report, therefore, is to highlight how participants feel about the vocationalism implied by internships, given the traditionally more scholarly philosophy of the liberal arts education.

Many humanities faculty believe that it is appropriate for them to concern themselves with their students' worries about what they will do with their education once they graduate. Yet they seldom meet with people in government or the private sector to discuss employment opportunities for their students. They are uncomfortable with the concept of experiential education and uncertain about the application of the liberal arts outside of academe. Well-designed internships can promote practical understanding and mutually beneficial relations between humanities faculty and the world off campus. It is our hope that the breadth and variety of internship activities emerging from this report will invite dialogue among faculty about ways in which internships can "fit into" and complement studies in the humanities.

After a brief discussion of the survey population and the representativeness of the sample, the report focuses on the questionnaire findings. Questionnaire A was returned by those who do not provide humanities students with access to internships. Questionnaire B was returned by those who do provide access to internships. Before each questionnaire

item is discussed, the findings are highlighted in tables. The tables are intended to make palpable for readers the enormous diversity and complexity of the internship activity that exists across the country and to provide easy reference points for those who might wish to flip back through the narrative or review it in summary form. It should also be noted that the analysis of Questionnaire A and B findings does not follow the sequence of items in the actual questionnaires. Some items were omitted from the discussion due to insufficient data. Others were grouped out of sequence for discussion according to theme. (Questionnaire A and B are reproduced in their entirety in Appendix A.)

The second part of the report presents a series of ten case studies illustrating the ways in which humanities students most commonly secure access to internships. The case studies make more concrete and meaningful some of the data analyzed in the Questionnaire B narrative.

The third part of the report suggests some principles of good practice. It compares findings in the two preceding sections with recommendations for good practice advanced in material prepared for the major professional organizations in the field of experiential learning: the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Learning (CAEL) and the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (NSIEE).

Available under separate cover is a Directory of the departments and central offices in our sample <4> that provide humanities majors with access to internships. The programs included range from the ad hoc and informal to the most highly structured. Faculty interested in obtaining information about internships may use the Directory to contact other faculty in their geographic area or in their discipline who have had experience with internships. The Directory will also function as a reference source for educators and employers seeking to initiate effective internship relationships.

1. SURVEY POPULATION

The population surveyed for this study represents the 2,006 colleges and universities in the United States that offer baccalaureate degrees; two-year colleges and graduate research institutes were excluded. Because this was the first national survey of the opportunities provided to humanities undergraduates to participate in work-and-learning internships, no accurate and complete mailing lists yet existed that were suitable for our purposes. Accordingly, several methods were used to contact humanities

---

<4> Questionnaires A and B included a guarantee of anonymity: "Please be assured that responses will not be identified with particular institutions; results will be reported only in aggregate." Departments and central offices listed in the Directory have authorized the inclusion of information on the administrative structure of their internship program, the program prerequisites, and the services provided to students.

departments and related campus offices that could contribute to a broad picture of institutional internship attitudes and practices.

Early in December 1983, humanities faculty were contacted through commercial mailing lists. Department chairs at colleges and universities across the country numbered 6,312 in the following disciplines:

TABLE 1 DEPARTMENTS SURVEYED AT INSTITUTIONS ACROSS THE COUNTRY n=6,312 <5>

English.....1,500	Philosophy.....1,000
American Studies.....311	Classics.....603
History.....750	Modern Foreign Languages <6>..1,748
Art History.....400	

Faculty in related fields that tend to include experiential learning as a built-in component of the curriculum—fields such as political science, communications, theatre, and the performing or visual arts--were not surveyed.

In addition, 2,407 questionnaires were sent to central on-campus offices. Internship, experiential learning and cooperative education offices were reached through mailing lists obtained from the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education (n=576) and the National Commission for Cooperative Education (n=238). To make up for any omissions of central offices on these lists, questionnaires were also mailed to deans of academic and student affairs (n=1,593) with a memo requesting that where appropriate, these be forwarded to offices on campus that provided internship opportunities to humanities majors. It is in this way that the questionnaires reached career planning and placement offices serving humanities students.

Humanities departments were asked to return either Questionnaire A, designed for departments that do not provide their undergraduate majors with access to internships, or Questionnaire B, designed for departments that do provide their majors with access to internships. Campus offices for internships and experiential and cooperative education received only Questionnaire B, as did the deans of academic and student affairs. In mid-December, all questionnaire recipients received a follow-up postcard reminding them that the deadline for returning the survey instrument was December 22, 1983.

<5> References to the "number" of respondents appear in the text as n=112, for example, or 6,312.

<6> Departments grouped under Modern Foreign Languages include Romance Languages, East Asian Languages, Spanish (or Spanish and Portuguese), French, Italian, Portuguese, German, Russian/Slavic Languages, Japanese, Chinese, and the combination of classical with any modern languages.

2. RESPONSE RATES AND REPRESENTATIVENESS OF RESPONSES

The departments and campus offices which received Questionnaires A and B, then, constituted a survey population of 8,719, approximately one quarter (28%) of them campus offices and the remaining three quarters departments. A total of 1,927 of the 8,719 questionnaires were returned; of these, 1,621 (84%) were used in the data analysis. Thus, the overall rate of response to the survey, based upon the number of usable returns, was 19%. Once adjusted for multiple returns from the same institution, our sample of 1,621 departments and campus offices represents close to half (43%) of the baccalaureate-granting institutions in the nation.

Returns on the two survey instruments, "A" and "B," were divided roughly 40-60 among respondents. Those who returned Questionnaire A, indicating that the department does not provide its undergraduate majors with access to internships, numbered 666 or 41% of the usable returns. They represent 11% of the nation's 6,312 humanities departments and come from 467 institutions or 23% of the nation's 2,006 baccalaureate-granting institutions. Respondents who returned Questionnaire B, indicating that the department or central office does provide access to internships, numbered 955 or 59% of the usable returns. They represent 15% of the nation's humanities departments and come from 620 institutions, demonstrating that nearly a third (31%) of all baccalaureate-granting institutions have some form of internship activity in the humanities.

Analysis of the usable responses from departments (Table 2) shows both the rate of return within each discipline and the percentage of the total survey sample constituted by returns from that discipline.

Art history had the highest rate of return among the various humanities disciplines on the mailing list, with 130 or one third of the 400 art history departments (see Table 1) sending back the survey instrument. Nevertheless, art history comprised only 8% of the 1,621 usable survey responses. The modern foreign languages and English constituted the largest percentage of the survey sample, 21% and 18% respectively.

In part the reason for this stronger showing is that English and the modern foreign languages constituted such a large part of the initial mailing list population. Reviewing a breakdown by department of responses to Questionnaire A ("No's") and Questionnaire B ("Yes's") will result in a more accurate sense of the degree of internship activity reported by the various humanities disciplines in our sample. The breakdown shows that among the departments in our sample, art history, American studies, history and English reported the greatest involvement with internships; classics, philosophy and modern foreign languages reported the least involvement (Table 3).

Of the 955 usable returns to Questionnaire B, 237 or 25% came from central on-campus offices. The greatest number of these came from career development or career placement centers (42%), while smaller numbers came from offices of cooperative education (24%) and experiential learning (14%), deans' offices (13%), and internship offices proper (8%).

TABLE 2 USABLE RETURNS BY DEPARTMENT/OFFICE--QUESTIONNAIRES A AND B n=1,621

Department	Total Number of Usable Returns ("A" and "B")	Rate of Return Within Discipline	% of Survey Sample
English	291	19%	18%
American Studies	55	18%	3%
History	196	26%	12%
Art History <7>	130	33%	8%
Philosophy	195	20%	12%
Classics	56	9%	3%
Modern Foreign Languages	339	19%	21%
Humanities Unspecified <8>	122		8%
Central Offices	237	10%	15%

TABLE 3 FREQUENCY OF "A's" and "B's" IN SAMPLE--BY DEPARTMENT

Department	A (No)	B (Yes)	Total Number of Usable Returns (A and B)
English	110 (38%)	181 (62%)	291
American Studies	15 (27%)	40 (73%)	55
History	61 (31%)	135 (69%)	196
Art History	27 (21%)	103 (79%)	130
Philosophy	147 (75%)	48 (25%)	195
Classics	45 (80%)	11 (20%)	56
* Modern Foreign Languages	227 (67%)	112 (33%)	339
Humanities Unspecified	34 (28%)	88 (72%)	122

* Details on the participation of specific modern foreign language departments appear in Appendix B.

<7> The tallies for art history may include a few studio art majors because in some schools art history is a concentration within the art department, and the responses provided made it difficult to distinguish the art from the art history interns.

<8> "Humanities Unspecified" encompasses returns from programs reporting for several humanities disciplines together, for example, a School of Humanities or a Humanities Division. Because we were primarily interested in individual disciplines comprising the humanities, we made no effort to reach conglomerate Humanities Divisions and the like through a separate mailing. A number nevertheless received the questionnaire through other channels and are therefore reported in the "% of Survey Sample" column. Since they did not constitute a mailing list group for this survey, however, there is no data to enter for them in the "Rate of Return within Discipline" column.

It is our view that the 955 departments and central offices that returned Questionnaire B represent a significant proportion of the internship activity available to humanities majors nationwide. That is because a department or campus office that provides internship activity for humanities students is probably more likely to respond to a survey of this kind than one that does not. Responses to Questionnaire B were far more numerous than anticipated; it is our view that they reflect with substantial accuracy the attitudes and practices of those who provide humanities undergraduates with access to internships.

3. ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Additional descriptive characteristics of the sample pertain to the institutions in which the responding departments and campus offices are located rather than the departments and offices themselves. They include the public-private status of institutions and their size. In addition, later coding based upon Cass and Birnbaum's Comparative Guide to American Colleges and Edward B. Fiske's Selective Guide to Colleges, 1984-85 made it possible to characterize the sample by selectivity and academic quality.

The following information shows that the data base for this study is overrepresented in terms of responses from three groups: 1) larger institutions, 2) public institutions, and 3) institutions that rank relatively high in terms of selectivity and academic quality. Smaller institutions, especially private colleges, are the most significantly underrepresented group. <9> This pattern is characteristic of both Questionnaire A and Questionnaire B respondents.

TABLE 4 INSTITUTIONAL TYPE--PUBLIC VS. PRIVATE (QUESTIONNAIRES A and B, Item #1)

Institutions Awarding the B.A.	Public	Private
* U.S. Colleges and Universities (n=2,006)	28%	72%
Questionnaire A Institutions (n=467)	52%	48%
Questionnaire B Institutions (n=620)	39%	61%

* Source: American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel

<9> Individual faculty and staff at small, private institutions typically demonstrate lower rates of response to questionnaire surveys, whether because of lack of support staff or for other reasons. Other researchers have encountered similar difficulties in surveying faculty at smaller institutions.

TABLE 5 INSTITUTIONAL SIZE--BY TYPE (QUESTIONNAIRES A and B, Item #1)

Institutions Awarding the B.A.	Under 1,000	1,000-2,499	2,500-4,999	5,000-9,999	Over 10,000
* U.S. Colleges and Universities	48%	23%	12%	9%	7%
Questionnaire A Institutions	15%	25%	19%	18%	23%
Questionnaire B Institutions	23%	30%	15%	14%	18%
Public Institutions					
* U.S. Colleges & Universities	14%	17%	22%	23%	24%
Questionnaire A Institutions	1%	6%	18%	28%	47%
Questionnaire B Institutions	2%	10%	19%	26%	44%
Private Institutions					
* U.S. Colleges & Universities	62%	26%	8%	3%	.8%
Questionnaire A Institutions	28%	42%	20%	9%	1%
Questionnaire B Institutions	37%	42%	12%	6%	2%

* Source: American Council on Education, Higher Education Panel

The principal impact of these differences in response rates from various types and sizes of institutions is that the findings are weighted toward the larger and public institutions. However, the majority of the students in this country are enrolled at such institutions, which helps to compensate for the imbalance. Smaller institutions in particular should be aware that the findings of the study may be less specifically descriptive of them.

The level of selectivity and academic quality of the respondents was determined by comparisons with institutions rated "Very Selective" and higher by Cass and Birnbaum and "high academic quality" (3-5 stars) by Edward B. Fiske. That is, by combining and refining the list of top institutions in the country developed by two leading college guides, we obtained an even more select group, comprised of 170 institutions, the top 8% of all U.S. colleges and universities. The institutions in our sample are well represented in that group. Departmental respondents to Questionnaire A include 67 of these institutions or 39% of the top group. These 67 selective institutions in turn comprise 14% of the institutions in the "A" sample. Departmental and central office respondents to Questionnaire B include 96 of the selective institutions or 56% of the top group. These 96 selective institutions in turn comprise 15% of the institutions in the "B" sample. This means that the percentage of highly selective institutions sponsoring humanities internships is nearly double the percentage (8%) of selective institutions in the nation.

. . . . .

In the analysis of Questionnaires A and B that follows, it should be remembered that, unless otherwise noted, findings refer to departments and offices--the groups surveyed in the study--rather than to institutions (the group which formed the basis of the preceding discussion of representativeness). Nearly a quarter of the institutions returned questionnaires from more than one on-campus source. This is true of both the "A" and "B" group, so that it is not clear from this data whether the presence of internship activity in one department means that other departments at the same institution are or are not more likely to have internship programs. It should be noted, however, that a number of departments reported that their institutions are currently taking steps to provide humanities internships specifically because of successful internship precedents elsewhere on campus. (See Table 9.)

Although many of the findings that follow may not come as a surprise to experts in the field of internships and experiential education, they nevertheless corroborate in a systematic way, with hard data, some speculations and hunches never before empirically assessed. The findings may be less familiar to humanities faculty. It is this group that we especially kept in mind during the writing of the report.

QUESTIONNAIRE A: THOSE WHO DO NOT SPONSOR INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES

Data gathered from the "A" questionnaires show that limits on the growth of departmental internship programs are rooted primarily in a lack of material resources and of information and ideas about how internships might appropriately relate to studies in the humanities. Deep-seated hostility to the concept of internships and comments about the difficulty of insuring the internship experience appeared less often. Although Questionnaire A respondents are not now sponsoring internships for their undergraduate majors, more than a fourth of them registered interest in instituting department-based programs.

Questionnaire A was filled out by humanities faculty whose departments do not provide their undergraduates with access to internships, either directly through the department or indirectly through another academic department, campus office or organization based off campus. Respondents who provide access in these ways or give credit in the major for any kind of ad hoc arrangement with individual faculty members, no matter how informal the arrangement, instead returned a "B" questionnaire.

As noted earlier, Questionnaire A respondents number 666 or 41% of the 1,621 usable returns. They represent 11% of the nation's humanities departments and 23% of its baccalaureate-granting institutions. Of these "A" returns, 59% came from departments that grant the B.A. as their highest degree, 19% came from departments that grant the M.A. as their highest degree, and 22% came from departments that grant the Ph.D. Departments of classics, philosophy and modern foreign languages report the least involvement with internships: of the overall survey sample of 1,621, 80% of the respondents in classics, 75% of the respondents in philosophy, and 67% of the respondents in modern foreign languages do not sponsor internships for their undergraduate majors. (See Table 3.)

1. RATIONALE FOR NOT SPONSORING INTERNSHIPS

Please indicate the reason(s) why your department does not provide internship experiences or access to such experiences to your undergraduate majors. (Questionnaire A, Item #4) n=651 (98%) <10>

Respondents' answers to this item can be grouped into two large categories: 1) faculty attitudes and 2) resource limitations. Faculty attitudes relate to the philosophical issues behind internships and the perceived difficulty of insuring the quality of the internship experience. Resource limitations may exist in the areas of funding and staffing or be manifest in a lack of interest and support from students, school

---

<10> Throughout the report, unless otherwise noted, response rate percentages have been computed individually for each question on the basis of the number of respondents answering that particular question.

administration, and sponsoring businesses and organizations. Many faculty noted more than one reason. Often these do not fall neatly into one or the other category. For example, such resource limitations as lack of released time or inadequate staffing can be related to faculty disinterest. Miscellaneous other kinds of comments account for 4% of the 2,082 individual responses to this question.

TABLE 6-A RATIONALE FOR NOT SPONSORING INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire A, Item #4) n=651 (98%)

Faculty Attitudes	Frequency/Percentage
Faculty have not expressed an interest	306 (47%)
Difficult to insure quality of internship experience	138 (21%)
Too many requirements already	83 (13%)
Detracts from course work	69 (11%)
* Not aware of the issue	66 (10%)
* Regret or uncertainty	56 (9%)
Weakens liberal arts orientation	54 (8%)
* Dismissal or irritation	44 (7%)
Concern that employers are looking for "cheap labor"	18 (3%)
Total number of responses <11>	834

* Starred entries represent comments added by respondents.

Answers indicating faculty disinterest or reservations numbered 40% of the checks recorded in all responses to this question. Nearly half of the respondents (47%) said outright that "faculty have not expressed an interest," though only a fifth (21%) cited the difficulty of insuring the quality of the internship experience. However, other answers also indicate doubts about academic quality, for example, comments that internships weaken the liberal arts orientation (noted by 8%) and detract from course work

<11> The inclusion of the "total number of responses" given in answer to an item provides a second way of assessing the relative importance of respondents' answers. The first way, the frequency count/percentage, reveals the number of respondents who picked certain comments among all those who answered the item. The second way can be used to reveal the number of times that a certain comment or group of comments appeared among all responses to the question.

This second way of assessing responses is useful when observing larger trends or tendencies. At such times, it is most meaningful to be able to compare the number of comments in the group under discussion--for example, Faculty Attitudes in Table 6-A--with the total number of comments offered in answer to the item (Rationale for Not Sponsoring Internships). Since many respondents checked more than one option in answering this item, it would not be especially helpful to add together frequency-count percentages. The totals would exceed 100%, as they do here and in many other tables.

(noted by 11%). Surprisingly few expressed concern that employers are looking for "cheap labor," a fear that might have been expected to appear widely among faculty worried about academic quality.

A number of faculty seemed rather favorably inclined toward internships even though they do not sponsor them. They expressed regret about not providing access: "Suitable internships for our majors are hard to find," or they registered what sounds like open-minded uncertainty: "What internship would be appropriate for this major?" (9%). In some cases, they evaluated the problem as "a lack of imagination on our part." But others voiced dismissal or irritation: "There is no need for internships in this field -- they are not appropriate" (7%). A surprisingly large number of respondents to the question (10%) also indicated that no one around them had brought up the subject, that they were not aware of it, or that they had not thought about it. Possibly this is attributable to the relative separateness of most academic communities. As an interesting sidelight on the issue, it is worth noting that a very few (less than 1%) reported that they had sponsored internship activity in the past, but that it had been discontinued. A few more (3%) reported that they were just now adding or considering adding an internship program.

Although more people checked "Faculty have not expressed an interest" than indicated any other single reason for not providing access to internships, resource limitations as a group appear much more often--56% of the time.

TABLE 6-B RATIONALE FOR NOT SPONSORING INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire A, Item #4) n=651 (98%)

Resource Limitations	Frequency/Percentage
There has been no student interest	289 (44%)
Geographic limitations: few local internship opportunities	271 (42%)
Inadequate number of faculty or staff to run the program	244 (37%)
Faculty would not get released time or other compensation	187 (29%)
Too costly	80 (12%)
The school administration does not support such efforts	80 (12%)
* There are too few students in the department	10 (2%)
Total number of responses	1,161

* Starred entries represent comments added by respondents.

Lack of student interest, and, hence, a lack of potential interns, is the resource limitation cited most frequently by respondents to this item (44%), almost as frequently as lack of faculty interest. Geographic constraints, however--the scarcity of internship opportunities available locally--were cited by almost as many (42%).

Only 12% of the respondents to this item specifically cited lack of support from the school administration as a reason for not providing humanities majors with access to internships, but that may be just the tip of the iceberg. The comments "Inadequate number of faculty or staff to run the program" and "Faculty would not get released time or other compensation," checked by 37% and 29% of the respondents respectively, point to a no-man's-land between department and administration in which it is difficult to pin down responsibility. It is worth noting that Questionnaire B returns reflect a similar uncertainty about who is responsible for inadequate material resources.

2. INTERNSHIP ACCESS OUTSIDE OF THE DEPARTMENT

Because we wished to determine not only the attitudes of faculty but the behavior of students in departments that do not provide access to internships, we asked a series of additional questions about access outside of the department.

Do your undergraduate majors participate in internships arranged outside of the department? (Questionnaire A, Item #5) n=652 (98%)

Over half (54%) of the respondents said that their majors do not go outside of the department to secure internship experience, but almost a third (28%) said that their majors do secure internship experience through non-departmental means. Another 19% said that they were not certain. While there is not enough data to determine the precise numbers of students who secure access to internships outside of the department, it is possible to say something about how these internships are arranged.

If your undergraduate majors participate in internships arranged outside of the department, who coordinates them? (Questionnaire A, Item #6) n=178 (27%) <12>

Virtually half (49%) of those who answered this question indicated that their majors secure access to internships through other academic departments. Another 13% specified that internships coordinated through other academic departments are part of a double major or a pre-professional program. Such programs, which are also cited in answers to the "B" questionnaire, apparently constitute on important way in which internships gain acceptance in humanities curricula.

<12> Even though they are only 27% of the "A" survey sample, the 178 constitute a good rate of response to this question. That is because they correspond so closely in number to the 181 (28%) who in answering Item #5 were certain that their majors participate in internships outside of the department.

A third of the respondents indicated that their majors secure non-departmental access to internships through a campus office, for example, an experiential learning, career services or cooperative education office. Smaller numbers noted study abroad that incorporates a substantial work component (10%) and access through internship programs or organizations based outside of the school (16%), for example, the Great Lakes College Association or the Washington Center.

Students whose participation in internships cannot be credited to the departmental major can still meet many of their other academic requirements through the experience, as is evidenced in responses to the next question:

What type of academic requirements, the major excluded, can be satisfied by internship experience? (Questionnaire A, Item #8) n=347 (52%)

Nearly half (42%) of those responding said that internship experience gained outside of departmental channels could satisfy no academic requirements. But the remaining 58% of the respondents said that such internships could satisfy some type of academic requirement, and many of them indicated more than one. Elective credit was cited by 43% of the respondents. Smaller numbers said that an internship arranged outside of the department could satisfy General Education requirements (9%) and requirements for graduation (20%). Once again, a number (5%) reported that internship experience satisfied requirements in a double major or pre-professional program.

3. CURRENT LEVELS OF INTEREST IN INTERNSHIPS

Because we were interested not only in the attitudes that have up until now prevailed among humanities faculty and students, but in shifts of attitude and the national internship climate overall, we asked a series of additional questions. These focus on current levels of interest in implementing department-based access to humanities internships. We also asked open-ended questions to determine the basis of this interest and the circumstances under which new programs might develop.

Interest Among Students

Have any of your current students expressed an interest in having department-based internships or access to internships through the department? (Questionnaire A, Item #9) n=582 (87%)

Those who believe that their students are now interested in department-based access to internships number 112 or 17% of the entire Questionnaire A survey sample. The basis of this interest was discussed in terms of students' vocational, integrative, academic and personal motives. "Integrative" motives signify a desire to integrate classroom learning with

practical experience in a "real world" work situation. Respondents often attributed more than one motive to students.

TABLE 7 BASIS OF CURRENT STUDENT INTEREST (Questionnaire A, Item #10) n=101 (15%)

Basis of Interest	Frequency/Percentage
Increased student employability, marketability	40 (40%)
Hands-on work experience (related to the major)	20 (20%)
Career exploration	7 (7%)
Academic benefits: Increased academic knowledge, sharpened academic skills	21 (21%)
Interdisciplinary and pre-professional studies, double majors	8 (8%)
Integration of academic knowledge with practical experience	19 (19%)
Money	4 (4%)
Personal maturation	3 (3%)
Other	11 (11%)
Total number of responses	133

Faculty emphasized various vocational motives above all else in assessing current student disposition toward internships. Vocational comments appeared 50% of the time, while integrative comments appeared 14% of the time, academic comments 22% of the time, and personal comments 5% of the time.

The vocational motive for student interest is reflected in comments that students desire career exploration, hands-on work experience (related to the major), and, especially, increased marketability in non-academic employment. The integrative desire to apply academic theory was cited by nearly a fifth (19%) of the faculty interpreting student interest. It should be noted, though, that a vocational motive such as desire for hands-on work experience (related to the major) is also integrative in nature and it too was cited by a fifth of the respondents.

A substantial number of respondents reported that current interest among students was motivated by academic considerations. Those who reported that students are interested in department-based internships because of a desire to increase their academic knowledge and sharpen their academic skills often referred to language studies and preparation for graduate school. This interpretation of student interest was noted mostly by faculty in modern foreign languages (12%), but also by some faculty in history (4%), and in philosophy (5%). (Presumably the history and philosophy faculty were thinking of graduate programs in applied studies.) Interdisciplinary studies, cited by 8% of the respondents, may also be regarded as an aspect of the academic motive, even though such studies often channel students in a

more vocation-conscious direction. Few faculty explained current student interest in terms of personal benefits such as maturation or money.

Interest Among Faculty

Are faculty members in your department now interested in offering majors department-based internships or access to internships? (Questionnaire A, Item #11) n=585 (88%)

Interest in instituting department-based internship activity is currently higher among faculty than among students. <13> Interested faculty number 170 or 26% of the entire Questionnaire A survey sample. Vocational, integrative and academic motives, among others, account for faculty interest, according to 146 respondents, most of whom discussed more than one factor in the open-ended format.

TABLE 8 BASIS OF CURRENT FACULTY INTEREST (Questionnaire A, Item #12) n=146 (22%)

Basis of Interest	Frequency/Percentage
Increased student employability, marketability	41 (28%)
Hands-on work experience for students	13 (9%)
Career exploration for students	9 (6%)
Business or organization approached school for interns	1 (.7%)
Students' integration of academic knowledge with practical experience	28 (19%)
Show that the humanities are good training for non-academic employment	5 (3%)
Closer campus-community relations	5 (3%)
Academic benefits for students: increased academic knowledge, sharpened academic skills	23 (16%)
Recruitment or retention of students in major	15 (10%)
Interdisciplinary and pre-professional studies, double majors	14 (10%)
Successful precedent elsewhere on campus	8 (5%)
Successful precedent off campus	7 (5%)
Desire to respond to student requests	6 (4%)
Student maturation	1 (.7%)
Other	14 (10%)
Total number of responses	190

<13> It is possible that the figures may instead mean that faculty are less aware of what students want than they are of what they and their colleagues want, but rates of response to Items #10 and #12 do not readily support that conclusion. The question about current student interest is answered by 87% of the "A" survey sample; the question about current faculty interest is answered by 88% of the "A" sample. Faculty at least feel they are as aware of students' attitudes as they are of their colleagues'.

Not unexpectedly, the 190 comments within the various groups of motives noted by faculty portray a somewhat different sense of priorities from those attributed to students. Still, it is not radically different. Even in faculty interest, vocational motives predominate, although they account in this item for only 34% of the comments entered, not 50%, as in the comments on student interest. Faculty say that integrative motives are more important to them than to students; they are noted 20% of the time in comparison to 14%. The same pattern holds true for academic motives, cited 27% of the time for faculty interest in comparison to 22% for student interest.

Desire to increase student employability and to provide students with some kind of career preparation for non-academic employment is still the most prevalent single comment, noted by 28% of the faculty responding to this item. The vocational motive was registered in other comments as well: the desire to give students opportunities for career exploration, the desire to give students opportunity for hands-on work experience related to the major and, in one case, the desire to respond to businesses or organizations approaching the school for interns.

Among the integrative motives, the desire to integrate academic knowledge with practical experience was cited by nearly a fifth of the respondents. Some faculty also explained their interest as a desire to show that the humanities are relevant to the "real world" and effectively prepare students for non-academic employment. Others noted a desire for closer campus-community relations: a social-minded aspect of the integrative motive.

With regard to academic motives for their current interest in internships, faculty reported being moved both by the desire that students increase their academic knowledge and sharpen their academic skills (16%), and by a commitment to interdisciplinary studies (10%). A substantial number registered the desire to recruit or retain students in the major (10%). Other factors influencing a smaller number of faculty were 1) on-campus precedents, which are internship successes in other programs and departments at the same institution; and 2) off-campus precedents or internship successes at other institutions. In addition, 4% of the respondents reported that faculty interest arose out of a desire to respond to student requests.

Further insight into faculty attitudes toward internships came from a philosophy department at a small (1,000-2,500), private college in the South. The department chair asked, "How do you have internships in Philosophy?", then added: "We don't have regular internships. . . . However in one area [of the major] we have an internship with [the Department of] Computer Science to [develop] a symbolic logic program." He explained that the basis of current faculty interest in offering students department-based internships or access to internships was the interdisciplinary subject of artificial intelligence and computers, a promising instance of the intersection of academic with more vocational concerns.

Indeed, the illustration serves to highlight an area of concern that respondents to Questionnaire A share with respondents to Questionnaire B: the

ability to find internship placements related to the major. Particularly in areas of relative geographic isolation, although not exclusively, imagination is essential to finding meaningful internship placements. In many instances, existing work situations can be developed or shaped to relate meaningfully to the major, even when a relationship is not apparent at first. Among our case studies, the Philosophy Department at Bowling Green State University and the History Department at Boston University have been especially creative about carving out significant internship experiences for their majors.

Interest Among Institutions

Is your institution currently taking steps to provide internships for humanities students? (Questionnaire A, Item #13) n=559 (84%)

Faculty were asked to characterize their institutions' levels of interest. Their responses show that intensity of institutional interest falls between student and faculty interest. Almost a fifth or 122 (18%) of the "A" survey sample reported that their institutions are now seeking to establish internships in the humanities and almost as many discussed the basis of this action, principally in terms of what might be called "administrative factors." Miscellaneous other comments about institutional motivation included the observation, made by 14 respondents (13%), that the school is just now adding or considering adding internships for humanities students.

TABLE 9 BASIS OF CURRENT INSTITUTIONAL ACTION (Questionnaire A, Item #14) n=107 (16%)

Basis of Action	Frequency/Percentage
Successful precedent elsewhere on campus	24 (22%)
Several departments or faculty members expressed interest	14 (13%)
Successful precedent off campus	4 (4%)
Make school more competitive with other institutions	2 (2%)
Increased student employability, marketability	18 (17%)
Career exploration for students	3 (3%)
Hands-on work experience for students	1 (.9%)
Academic benefits for students: increased academic knowledge, sharpened academic skills	8 (7%)
Interdisciplinary and pre-professional studies, double majors	7 (7%)
Students' integration of academic knowledge with practical experience	7 (7%)
Show that the humanities are good training for non-academic employment	4 (4%)
Closer campus-community relations	2 (2%)
Student maturation	3 (3%)
Other	26 (24%)
Total number of responses	123

Administrative factors as a group are discussed 36% of the time by respondents. Next in importance are vocational motives, noted as 18% of the responses; academic motives, noted as 12% of the responses; and integrative motives, noted as 11% of the responses.

Administrative factors include successful on-campus precedents; interest specifically expressed by departments or faculty on campus, even without precedents; off-campus precedents; and a desire to make the institution more competitive with other institutions. The single most frequently cited motive among the administrative factors and, indeed, among all institutional motives is the on-campus precedent--internship successes in programs or departments at the same institution--cited by 22% of the respondents. These figures suggest that internships are "catching," that the opportunity to see close-up what internships are and how they work is more effective than anything else in dispelling suspicion of and disinterest in humanities internships. In addition, the fact that on-campus precedents weigh so much more with the administration (according to 24 respondents in Item #14) than with faculty (according to 8 respondents in Item #12) perhaps indicates a greater openness among those in the administration to being persuaded, especially when faced with tangible evidence that internships at that very institution "work."

Thus, the data suggest that the best chance for faculty who want to introduce humanities internships on their campus may be to approach the administation with illustrations drawn on the experiences of other departments at the same institution. Since nearly a third of the respondents, numbering 181, indicated on Item #5 that their students are able to take part in internships through other departments, such an approach may be feasible at many institutions. It is worth noting in this regard that nearly a third (32%) of the Questionnaire B respondents reporting on the factors that played a role in their decision to sponsor internship activity (Item #7) point to the influence of individuals in the administration.

4. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Nearly a third (30%) of the Questionnaire A survey sample made a number of additional comments (Item #15) that provide further insight into the concerns of humanities faculty not presently engaged in internship activity.

A sizable number of them (31%) said that the internship concept was attractive in principle or was of significant interest. Indeed, another 5% specified a need for more information on the subject. Only 8% of the respondents said either that they personally were strongly opposed to internships for the liberal arts major (or for their particular major), or that faculty around them had strong reservations about the appropriateness of internships to study in the humanities. The numbers indicate that resource limitations pose a more serious obstacle to the acceptance of internships in

the humanities than do attitudes. Respondents commented on limitations in the area both of funding (4%) and of time and staffing (6%).

A few respondents indicated that the department offered internships on the graduate level (4%) and a few more noted that their departments were just now adding or considering adding internships for humanities students (6%). <14>

5. SUMMARY

It thus appears that there is a significant level of interest in internships even among humanities departments that do not provide their majors with access. Despite 47% who point to "lack of faculty interest" as the reason they do not sponsor departmental access to internships, further comments suggest that this disinterest is not fixed, but circumstantial. It is held in place less by deep-rooted fears about the difficulty of insuring the quality of the internship experience than by concern about various resource limitations: inadequate number of faculty or staff to run the program, lack of released time or other compensation, and inadequate internship opportunities in the area. The fact that the "B" survey sample is so well represented in terms of selective institutions further suggests that concern about academic quality does not overshadow the field.

<14> Respondents who specifically noted that their departments are about to add or are considering adding internships for humanities students number 41 on three different items of Questionnaire A (#4, #14, and #15). This number has been corrected for repeats and represents 6% of the "A" survey sample.

QUESTIONNAIRE B: THOSE WHO SPONSOR INTERNSHIPS IN THE HUMANITIES

Data gathered from the "B" questionnaires suggest that preserving educational quality is a priority for those who provide humanities undergraduates with access to internships. Humanities internship programs have been careful to safeguard the intellectual integrity of work-and-learning experiences through policies governing prerequisites, evaluation, grading, grades of "Incomplete," and the amounts and forms of credit awarded for the experience. Perhaps most significant in this respect is the finding that fully four fifths (82%) of those in our sample who provide internships to humanities students administer programs that are based in departments and that therefore develop their identity in the context of the academic curriculum.

Questionnaire B was filled out by respondents whose departments or campus offices provide humanities undergraduates with access to internships. "Access" includes credit in the major for internships arranged outside of the department as well as ad hoc arrangements with individual members of the department, no matter how informal the arrangements.

As noted before, of the 1,621 usable returns, 955 or 59% came from Questionnaire B respondents. They represent 15% of the nation's humanities departments and 31% of its baccalaureate-granting institutions. Nearly two thirds (64%) of the respondents said that the B.A. was the highest degree they offered, while 23% indicated that the M.A. was their highest degree and 13% checked the Ph.D. Departments of art history, American studies, history and English report the greatest involvement with experiential education. In the overall survey sample of 1,621, 79% of the respondents in art history, 73% in American studies, 69% in history, and 62% in English sponsor internship activity or access to internships for their undergraduate majors. (See Table 3.)

1. HISTORY AND RATIONALE OF INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

This section focuses on the founding dates of internship programs, the factors that influenced their establishment, and the purposes they are seen as serving.

Since when have humanities majors had access to internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #6) n=798 (84%)

The 1970's and early 1980's saw explosive growth in internship programs <15> for humanities undergraduates. Only 10% of those responding to the

---

<15> The word "program" is used to designate even informal internship activity, including ad hoc arrangements between faculty and students. The phrase "Department-coordinated program" refers to programs with a relatively high degree of formality and centralization within the department.

question about program founding dates offered humanities internships before 1970: 4% of them before 1965 and 6% between 1965 and 1969. During the 1970's, another 63% of the respondents gave humanities undergraduates access to internships: 25% of them between 1970 and 1974, and 38% between 1974 and 1979. Since 1980, an additional 25% of the respondents have established humanities internship programs. Thus, somewhat more than a third (35%) of the respondents have offered internship access to humanities students ten or more years, while nearly two thirds of them established internship activity within the last ten years, one fourth of them since 1980.

What factors played a role in your decision to offer students access to internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #7) n=874 (92%)

Respondents' answers to this question indicate that a range of motives and incentives figured in the establishment of internship programs for humanities students. Respondents checked as many factors as applied.

TABLE 10 FACTORS IN THE DECISION TO OFFER INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire B, Item #7) n=874 (92%)

Factor	Frequency/Percentage
Student interest	747 (86%)
Faculty interest	611 (70%)
Desire to retain majors	295 (34%)
Employers in area began requesting student interns	251 (29%)
Suggestion by president, dean or other administrators	278 (32%)
Suggestion arising from institutional review or self-study	188 (22%)
Change in educational philosophy	161 (18%)
Other	133 (15%)

Student and faculty interest were the decisive factors in the decision to offer internships, with more than a third of the respondents also specifying a faculty desire to retain majors. In addition, nearly a third pointed to the role of employers in the area who began requesting student interns. Employer interest of this intensity is probably related to an institution's closeness to urban areas. Conversely, in answering the question, "What difficulties have you encountered in sponsoring or providing students with access to internships?" (Questionnaire B, Item #31), 30% of the respondents indicated that the location of their institution poses a significant obstacle to internship activity.

Over half of the respondents (54%) pointed to the role played by the school administration--through suggestions coming from an administrator (32%) or through institutional self-study (22%)--in motivating the decision to

establish an internship program. In addition, 14% attributed the decision to offer internships (through comments offered under "Change in educational philosophy" and "Other") to a shift from an exclusively academic to a more career-conscious perspective. Presumably changes of that type and magnitude were coordinated through the administration. Another 4% (also offering comments under "Change in educational philosophy" and "Other") reported the influence of interdisciplinary programs, pre-professional training and double majors or minors.

What do you see as the purpose of internships for humanities students? (Questionnaire B, Item #9) n=895 (94%)

Respondents selected vocational purposes far more often than any other group of purposes to explain what they see as the rationale for internships in the humanities. Other respondents see the purpose of internships as integrative and academic.

TABLE 11 RATIONALE FOR SPONSORING INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire B, Item #9) n=895 (94%)

Purpose	Frequency/Percentage
Career exploration	811 (91%)
Acquisition of general work experience	563 (63%)
Development of specific work skills	545 (61%)
Integration of academic knowledge with practical experience	830 (93%)
Student maturation	662 (74%)
Acquisition of academic knowledge, sharpening of academic skills	294 (33%)
Other	74 (8%)
Total number of comments entered	3,779

Vocational purposes accounted for 52% of all responses to the item, in terms of career exploration; acquisition of general work experience; development of specific work skills; and the comment "student employability, marketability," which respondents added under "Other." The importance attached to vocational purposes is corroborated by data for Item #10: "In your experience, are humanities students who have had internships more successful at obtaining employment after graduation?" (n=784 or 82%). Four fifths (81%) of those responding reported that former interns are, in fact, more employable after graduation.

After vocational purpose, the most frequently cited purpose for humanities internships was integrative, indicating a desire to relate liberal arts knowledge to experience outside of the classroom. Respondents noted the integrative purpose 22% of the time by checking "Integration of academic knowledge with practical experience."

Academic purpose was given far less often as the rationale for providing internships to humanities students. Although as many as a third of the respondents selected "Acquisition of academic knowledge" as one of the purposes of internships, Table 11 shows that this is not many compared with the frequency of response for other purposes. In fact, comments about academic purpose accounted for only 8% of all responses to the item, whether that purpose was expressed directly as "Acquisition of academic knowledge" or indirectly, under "Other," as "Foreign language or bilingual opportunities" or "Interdisciplinary and pre-professional studies; double majors or minors."

Often comments about the purpose of internships for humanities students cannot be neatly categorized. For example, the rationale "Interdisciplinary or pre-professional studies" often represents a vocational motive within the academic curriculum, in the same way that the comment "Acquisition of general work experience," although it highlights a vocational objective, implies an integrative purpose. After all, students can get "general work experience" from any job, but an internship gives them general work experience related to the major—an integrative goal. Respondents to subsequent questions in many cases spelled out their desire that the internship work be related to the major. The same kind of rich complexity and overlap that emerges from these comments is typical of many other areas of attitude and practice in the provision of internships in the humanities.

Finally, a group of miscellaneous purposes, accounting for only 18% of all responses, included the comments "Student maturation" and "Money (pay) for students." This finding should not, however, obscure the fact that student maturation was singled out by nearly three quarters (74%) of the respondents as at least one of the purposes of internships.

2. HOW INTERNSHIPS ARE PROVIDED TO HUMANITIES STUDENTS

This section focuses on the structures through which students secure access to internships; the sources of funding for these structures; the internship services provided through them; the special training or work experience that may be required of those who administer the internships; and the forms of compensation, both short and long-term, that may be awarded for administering internships.

When asked to indicate how humanities majors obtain access to internships, respondents in departments and central offices checked the following range of structures for internship activity:

TABLE 12 STRUCTURES THROUGH WHICH STUDENTS OBTAIN ACCESS (Questionnaire B, Item #3) n=954 (99%)

Structure	Frequency/Percentage
Through the department	783 (82%)
Department chair	245 (26%)
Department's administrative staff	54 (6%)
Graduate students	7 (.7%)
Individual faculty in ad hoc arrangements with students	362 (38%)
Faculty-coordinated department program	260 (27%)
Through other academic departments	224 (23%)
Through central offices on campus	579 (61%)
Through internship programs or organizations based outside of the school	222 (23%)
Other	134 (14%)

It is significant for an understanding of internship programs that most students' access comes through multiple channels. Two thirds of the departments and central offices answering this item noted that students have more than one way of securing access to internships.

The most popular form of internship access is "Through the department," which is favored by a large majority of the respondents (82%) when used in combination with other forms of access, and by almost one fourth (24%) even when used alone. The most popular of the access combinations is a department and a central office on campus, a combination checked by nearly half (45%) of the respondents to this item. <16>

Internships, then, are most commonly provided to humanities students through their departments. When provision comes from both a department and a central office in access "combination," it may mean many things. For example, the central office may maintain files of placements and the department may do the rest, advising, screening, placing, supervising and evaluating students. In other cases, though, the central office and the department may both advise students on placements, and the central office may also teach students how to prepare résumés and make field contacts, and then help them evaluate and adjust to the workplace experience through a series of concurrent seminars. In still other cases, the central office will also place students and make site visits. There are even times when a department and a central office at the same institution offer students not coordinated but parallel internship programs, each of them separately equipped to handle all aspects of the internship.

<16> The findings on single-use access and access "combinations" are not reflected in Table 12.

When internships are provided to students through the coordinated efforts of a department and central office, there are the advantages of a division of responsibility and costs. Sharing of responsibility, for example, is likely to ease time and money constraints for faculty who find that locating and developing placements is very time-consuming work, often without compensation, and that publicizing the internship program may be both time-consuming and costly. Commenting later on program difficulties (Item #31), 11% of the respondents did, in fact, report severe time constraints.

Smaller numbers indicated that students have access to internships through the combination of their own department and some other academic department (21%), presumably for interdisciplinary or pre-professional studies. Almost as many (19%) said that students participate in internships through the combination of their own department and an internship program or organization based outside of the school, in academic consortia such as the Great Lakes College Association or free-standing educational organizations such as the Washington Center.

Within the department, internships administered by faculty members in ad hoc arrangements with students are most prevalent, checked by 38% of the respondents in conjunction with other forms of access. In an ad hoc arrangement, a student approaches a faculty member for sponsorship. There is no single coordinating mechanism within the department for handling internships. The next most popular forms of departmental access are internships administered through a department-coordinated program or by a department chair, each option checked by over a quarter of the respondents in combination with other forms of access. In department-coordinated programs, there is typically a single person in charge of coordinating or administering the internship activity. It is indicative of the seriousness with which departments generally regard internships that so few programs (.7%) are administered by graduate students, even though 36% of the respondents who provide undergraduates with access to internships have programs of graduate studies at either the masters (23%) or doctoral (13%) level.

It might be noted, in addition, that the single most popular form of access combination within the department is the department chair working with individual faculty members who have ad hoc arrangements with students, a combination cited by 7%. The combination of ad hoc departmental arrangements and a department-coordinated program might seem unlikely, but it is cited by 4% of those answering the question. The combination means that a single faculty member "coordinates" the internship activities of the department, including those of other faculty members working with students on a more informal, ad hoc basis.

A central on-campus office is the second most common administrative channel overall through which humanities students take part in internships. It is cited by 61% of the respondents in combination with other forms of access, but by only 11% when used by students exclusive of any other channels. This last statistic indicates how few internship programs for humanities students are, in our sample, operated out of central offices

alone. As noted before, almost half (45%) specified that their students take part in internships arranged through both the department and the central office. Another 17% reported that students take part in internships arranged through both the central office and internship programs or organizations based outside of the school.

Respondents indicated that programs and organizations outside of the school constitute a third, less prevalent channel that students in the humanities use to take part in internships. Overall, the option was checked by 23% of the respondents in combination with other forms of access; only four of these 222 indicate that they use this means of access exclusive of any others.

What is the source of your present funding? (Questionnaire B, Item #8) n=885 (93%)

Over a third (38%) of the respondents receive special funds from one or more sources, including the institution, the department, corporations and the government. A third of these receive institutional funding, primarily for internship activity located in a central office. Fewer than a tenth, however, receive funds from departmental budgets. This suggests an extremely high level of commitment among those who provide humanities students with internships through departmental means. Government grants are a source of funding for 11% of the respondents (10% of them receive funds from the federal government, 1% from the state), while corporate grants are a source of support for another 2%. But nearly two thirds of the respondents--549 or 62%--reported that there are no funds specifically allocated for internship activity.

Through the various channels of access, and with or without specific allocation of funds, Questionnaire B respondents provide humanities undergraduates with a wide range of internship services.

TABLE 13 INTERNSHIP SERVICES (Questionnaire B, Item #24) n=872 (91%)

Services	Frequency/Percentage
Counseling of students interested in internships	802 (92%)
Assistance to students in securing placements	708 (81%)
Evaluation of students at end of internship	692 (79%)
Identification and certification of work sites	651 (75%)
Supervision during internship	646 (74%)
Recruiting and/or screening of students	618 (71%)
Pre-internship orientation	467 (54%)
Concurrent seminar	158 (18%)
Organized period of post-internship assessment by students	102 (12%)
Other	55 (6%)

Nearly all of the respondents who provide services counsel students interested in internships, and three fourths or more of them also help identify work sites and assist students with placement. The seriousness with which respondents approach internships is suggested by the large number who supervise their students during the process (74%) and evaluate them at the end (79%).

However, there is comparatively less for students in the way of other kinds of institutional services, either at the beginning, middle or end of the internship experience. While about half of the programs provide pre-internship orientation (54%), fewer than a fifth offer a concurrent seminar (18%), and only 1% offer an organized period of post-internship assessment in which students reflect back upon the internship and discuss or write critically about what they have learned. This underdevelopment may be a sign of the relative newness of internships in the humanities and their lack of institutionalization. In addition, the rather small number of respondents who provide students with a concurrent seminar connected with the internship may reflect the relative importance assigned (in Item #9) to vocational over academic or even integrative purposes. It should also be noted that a greater number of respondents--25%--evaluate students at the end of the internship on the basis of participation in concurrent seminars (Table 16) than offer concurrent seminars as a service. Although they themselves are not able to provide it as a service, they apparently regard a concurrent seminar as an important enough component to have students get it somewhere else at the institution.

Is special training and/or work experience required of faculty or staff who administer the internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #27) n=840 (88%)

Three fourths of the respondents to this question indicated that no special training or work experience is required. Among the 25% who said that special preparation of some kind is required, the preference was strongest for background in the area of the internship, required by 10% of the respondents, rather than for training or workshops that specifically equip faculty or staff to administer internships. Only 3% said that training is required of staff and only 2% that special training is given to faculty before they administer internships. The implication is that expertise in the area of internships is regarded as important enough to justify requiring it in advance, but not important enough to justify training on-the-job.

One corollary, perhaps, of the relatively low percentage required to have special training or preparation is a correspondingly small number who receive compensation or reward, as seen in the following.

What compensation is given for administering internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #25) n=867 (91%)

Over a third (39%) of those who answered this question receive one or more forms of compensation for administering internships. The single most

popular form of compensation is course load credit, although it is awarded to only 21% of the respondents. A few receive extra salary (8%), released time (8%), and service credit (4%). Others (8%), in central offices, added the comment that administering internships is part of their regular paid job. Nonetheless, 61% of the respondents to this question receive no form of compensation whatsoever for their involvement with internships. They provide services to interns or administer internship programs without remuneration, as an extra workload. This finding agrees with data for Item #8 showing that nearly two thirds of those who operate internship programs do not have any special allocation of funds from institutional, departmental, or other sources.

In such cases, departmental internships are especially vulnerable. If internship activity depends solely upon a faculty member's good will and interest and that faculty member leaves, the internship activity may cease. Such lack of institutionalization means that programs will forever have to "reinvent the wheel."

Is administration of internships given consideration in promotion, tenure, or merit pay evaluations? (Questionnaire B, Item #26) n=334 (35%)

Slightly over a third (35%) of the Questionnaire B survey sample indicated that involvement in internships and their administration carries weight in decisions regarding long-range rewards. Two thirds (69%) of this group noted that involvement in internships affects promotion, 60% noted tenure, and 61% noted merit pay. Relative to the whole "B" survey sample of 955, however, the number of respondents who receive long-term rewards is small. Coupled with the only somewhat larger group of 336 who receive short term compensation (Item #25), the inference again is that most respondents' involvement with internships is motivated primarily by a sense of commitment: in providing students with internships, faculty work essentially as volunteers.

3. STUDENT PROCESS

This section focuses on the student's part of the internship experience. It includes the prerequisites for participating in an internship; the location of placements; the extra fees, if any, that students pay to participate in internships; the number of programs in which students are paid a stipend or salary for internship work; the attitude toward student learning plans or contracts; and the number of hours that students typically work.

In 15% of the responding programs, students have no prerequisites to meet. But 85% of the programs exercise quality control by requiring students to meet certain requirements before they can take part in internships.

TABLE 14 PREREQUISITES FOR PARTICIPATION IN INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire B, Item #11) n=885 (93%)

Prerequisites		Frequency/Percentage
No prerequisites		129 (15%)
Minimum grade-point average		423 (48%)
C	119 (28%)	
C+	127 (30%)	
B-	21 (5%)	
B	124 (29%)	
B+	11 (3%)	
Class year (earliest year permitted)		624 (71%)
Freshman	8 (1%)	
Sophomore	185 (30%)	
Junior	361 (58%)	
Senior	62 (10%)	
Minimum number of credits in the major		263 (30%)
Preparatory course		206 (23%)
Other		239 (27%)

About half (48%) of the respondents to this question required a minimum grade-point average for participation in internships. Nearly three quarters (71%) had a class-year requirement. Roughly a third (30%) also required a minimum number of credits in the major, and almost a quarter (23%) required a preparatory course. Among "Other" requirements, comments noting faculty recommendations or department approval were added to the questionnaire by 11%. It is our speculation that the percentage might have been much higher if faculty approval had appeared as an option on the questionnaire. After all, among faculty who agree to sponsor students on an ad hoc basis, faculty approval is by definition a prerequisite for the internship—and this ad hoc group constituted 38% of the total "B" sample.

From these data it appears that quality control and screening are typically exercised in controlling student access to internships. These standards, however, may not be expressed solely in terms of grades. Of those who indicated a minimum grade-point average, 58% accepted a C or C+; only 32% required a B or better. But restrictions on class year are tighter, with 68% of those who indicated a class-year cutoff restricting access to juniors and seniors; only 31% permit sophomores and freshmen to participate in internships.

We can speculate that since the content and purpose of internships is not principally academic, faculty do not apply strictly the criterion of academic performance in selecting participants. They do, however, limit participation to more capable and experienced students—as determined by number of credits in the major and class year—and in at least 11% of the

internship programs, firsthand faculty knowledge of the student personalizes and refines the selection process.

Are students required to find their own placements? (Questionnaire B, Item #14) n=856 (90%)

In addition to meeting certain requirements to participate in internships, students in roughly a third (29%) of the respondents' programs are also required to find their own placements. The data indicated, however, that even in these programs, students often receive assistance. Consider the fact that while only 550 respondents report here that they assist students, a much larger number of the "B" sample--708 respondents--report (in Item #24) that one of the services they offer students is placement assistance.

What percentage of students taking internships are placed locally, in the state, throughout the nation, and internationally? (Questionnaire B, Item #12) n=716 (75%)

Local internships account for placements in 86% of the programs responding to this question, with nearly two thirds (62%) of them indicating that more than half of their interns work locally. Participation in internships drops dramatically when placement sites are located at a distance from the institution.

TABLE 15 LOCATION OF INTERNSHIP PLACEMENTS RELATIVE TO HOME INSTITUTION (Questionnaire B, Item #12) n=716 (75%) <17>

	Local	State	National	International
?	29 (4%)	23 (3%)	17 (2%)	6 (.8%)
0%	97 (14%)	53 (49%)	385 (54%)	615 (86%)
1-50%	144 (20%)	271 (38%)	273 (38%)	80 (11%)
51-100%	446 (62%)	69 (10%)	1 (6%)	15 (2%)

Only 51% of those responding to this question place any students at all at the state level and fewer than half (46%) place students at the national level. No more than 13%-14% place students internationally. Furthermore, even in these programs, the distant placements affect relatively few students. For example, although 51% of the respondents place students statewide, only 10% place more than half of their interns statewide. At the national level, the number of students affected is even smaller--only 6% of the respondents place more than half of their students around the nation.

<17> A question mark ("?") was entered by respondents who did not know the percentage of students involved, but knew the level at which there were placements. For this reason, the overall percentages cited in the discussion of local, state, national, and international placements include the respondents who entered question marks.

And only 2% of the programs are able to place more than half of their students internationally.

From answers to a later question about the difficulties of providing students with access to internships, it is easy to see why distant placements are less frequent. Responding to the open-ended question, "What difficulties have you encountered in sponsoring or providing students with access to internships?" (Item #31), 18% of the respondents commented that there are not enough positions available locally, suggesting that more distant placements might alleviate the problem. But 12% also cited problems with logistics--students' schedules and transportation--and 11% pointed to problems posed by students' financial situations and the lack of paying internships. These difficulties confine internship activity to the approximate location of the institution as well as limit the number of hours per week that students can work in the internship.

What extra fees, if any, do students pay to participate in internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #17) n=795 (83%)

Very few programs charge students additional fees for internships beyond the cost per credit hour in tuition that is charged for all courses. Only 5% of the respondents to the question said that students pay extra and the amounts vary so greatly--from $5 to $1,350 <18>--that they yield no discernible pattern.

This is an area in which additional information might be particularly valuable, given the scarcity of faculty rewards for administering internships and the lack of departmental and institutional funding. We simply do not know how many students would be willing to pay extra for internship services.

Although very few students pay extra for internships, many more are themselves paid, as answers to the following question show.

What percentage of your interns, if any, typically receive a stipend or salary? (Questionnaire B, Item #16) n=805 (84%)

Over half of the programs (57%) reported that some students receive a stipend or salary in the internship, but this by no means includes all of the students in these programs. For example, nearly half (43%) of the respondents who indicated that financial reward is involved for interns reported that no more than a quarter of the students are paid. Only a quarter (28%) of them indicated that over three quarters of their interns are paid. We can speculate, on the basis of comments made by the internship

---

<18> The figure of $1,350 was reported by the cooperative education office of a small college in the South, which also reported that 100% of its students are paid for their internships. Students work full-time for a semester and can apply the 15 credits they earn toward requirements in the major or graduation.

programs covered as case studies, that most students who receive pay do their internships with businesses. In some cases, institutions have worked out innovative arrangements with nonprofit sponsors whereby students receive pay equal to the tuition costs of the credits they earn in the internship experience. In other cases, students are reimbursed for travel expenses.

Are formal learning plans or contracts required of each intern? (Questionnaire B, Item #18) n=863 (90%)

Formal learning plans or contracts indicate a closely monitored internship program that gives high priority to student initiative and on-the-job learning. Over three quarters (77%) of the internship programs responding to this question require formal learning plans or contracts of each intern. On a subsequent question (Item #19), over half of the respondents reported that they use learning plans or contracts to evaluate student performance during the internship. Nevertheless, only 2% of the respondents cited a well worked-out learning plan in discussing what constitutes a high-quality internship experience (Item #29) and what has made their program successful (Item #30). Apparently, learning plans are perceived as a basic part of a well-designed internship program, but one that is so basic it may be taken for granted: with a learning plan or contract in place, respondents feel, other factors determine the success of the experience.

How many hours weekly do your humanities interns typically work? (Questionnaire B, Item #15) n=770 (81%)

The hours spent on the job are the heart of most students' internship experiences. Over three quarters (84%) of the usable answers to this question come from programs on the semester system, 14% come from programs on the quarter system, and 3% come from programs offering the internship during a miniterm.

In our sample, most students who intern on the semester system work 1½ to 2½ days a week. While roughly a fifth (18%) typically work 1-9 hours a week (most of them more than 6 hours), roughly the equivalent of 1 workday a week, the largest group, roughly two fifths (38%), work an average of 10-20 hours a week, most of them 10-15 hours, or 1½ to 2 days. Another fifth work 20-40 hours a week, most of them 20-30 hours, the equivalent of 2½ to 4 days of work a week. Only 11% of those on the semester system typically intern a full 40-hour week. Of those responding from semester programs, 7% specified "Varies" to indicate that the length of their interns' week varies significantly from one internship to another, while 6% entered numerical ranges whose width (for example, 1-25 or 10-40) also suggests there may be considerable accommodation to the needs of the particular internship and student.

In programs at schools on the quarter system, the pattern is similar. Those who report that interns work an average of fewer than 10 hours a week

total 11%, while those who report that interns typically work 10-20 hours a week total 43%. In the case of both semester and quarter systems, then, somewhat more than half the interns typically work no more than 20 hours a week. This leaves them enough time to continue progress work toward the degree without excessive interruption. Only in the programs operated on a miniterm schedule do most (81%) of the interns work full-time, making it impossible for them to pursue traditional academic studies concurrently, but this is consistent with the purpose of miniterms, which often is to provide students with less structured or more experimental learning opportunities.

4. STUDENT EVALUATION AND THE FULFILLING OF ACADEMIC REQUIREMENTS

At the end of an internship, a student's work is evaluated to determine what, if any, grade should be assigned and whether any academic requirements have been satisfied by the work experience. Respondents use a broad range of evaluation mechanisms to assess student performance.

TABLE 16 METHODS OF EVALUATING INTERNSHIPS (Questionnaire B, Item #19) n=874 (92%)

Methods of Evaluation	Frequency/Percentage
On-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations	784 (90%)
Journals, logs, progress reports	710 (81%)
Site visits and/or telephone calls by faculty	558 (64%)
Term papers	474 (54%)
Oral reports	448 (51%)
Evaluation of learning plans or contracts	450 (51%)
Exit interviews	373 (43%)
Participation in courses conducted concurrently with the internship	219 (25%)
Written examinations	50 (6%)
* Material produced by intern on the job	26 (3%)
* Regular student meetings with faculty	9 (1%)

* Starred entries represent comments added by respondents.

The mechanisms most frequently used to measure student performance in internships are comments and written evaluations from supervisors at the workplace (90%), and student journals, logs and progress reports (81%). These methods enable campus-bound educators to overcome, as much as possible, their separation from the scene of learning and to evaluate the internship on its own terms rather than on imported academic terms. Several other widely-used evaluation mechanisms also grow out of the internship. Site visits and calls to the intern at the workplace were checked by nearly two thirds of the respondents (64%); learning plans or contracts by half (51%); and exit interviews by 43%. Adding to the options presented in the

questionnaire, a few respondents (3%) reported that they tied evaluation even more closely to the internship experience by evaluating interns on the basis of materials they produce on the job--press releases, newsletter articles, exhibition catalogues, and so forth. It seems likely that the number who evaluate students in this way would have registered as higher if the option had been offered on the questionnaire. It is difficult to imagine that interns in only 3% of the programs produce materials for the internship and, if such material is generated, it is difficult to imagine that it would not be used in evaluation. Another 3% added the comment that students produce a self-evaluation (paper) at term's end which, in turn, becomes one means of evaluating them.

The differences between an internship and a traditional course emerge most sharply in the finding that only 6% of the respondents use written examinations to evaluate student learning in internships, while over half (54%) use term papers. As traditional indicators of textbook learning and its integration with classroom lecture, written examinations are probably less valid as measures of knowledge gained in an experiential process than term papers. Papers can be used to weave together academic theory and its practice in an extended narrative arising out of the internship experience itself. The fact that only 25% tied evaluation to concurrent, related course work again suggests how far away internship learning is from traditional classroom learning. It also suggests how much imaginative work can still be done to bridge the two experiences through a course or seminar. Among the case study schools in the next section, Scripps College has been particularly imaginative in this respect.

After evaluating students by various means, most programs assign grades, as shown by answers to the next question:

What evaluation system is used to assess the student's internship experience? (Questionnaire B, Item #20) n=877 (92%)

Only 5% of those answering this question indicated that their internships are never graded. Another 3% of the programs checked off "No grades given" and one of the grading options, meaning that some of their internships might be graded and others not, depending upon the nature of the placement or the student's choice. Among the 95% who assign grades for internships, nearly two thirds (63%) favor the A-F scale, either singly or in combination with other grading options. Somewhat fewer than half (45%) indicated that they use the Pass/Fail option, either singly or in combination with other grading arrangements. The popularity of the A-F scale suggests that considerable evaluative rigor is the norm with internships.

What percentage of your interns typically take an "Incomplete" each year? (Questionnaire B, Item #21) n=746 (78%)

It is a further indication of considerable academic rigor that more than two thirds (68%) of those responding said that they do not allow

"Incompletes." About a third (n=242) do grant "Incompletes," but to relatively few students. For example, close to half of them typically grant "Incompletes" only to 1%-5% of their students, generally for some delay in the exit interview process or in the processing of paperwork connected with the internship. Another third of those awarding "Incompletes" typically allow 6%-50% of their students each year to take them. Only a very small number--3%--typically permit over 50% of their students to take "Incompletes" each year. (Another 14% were uncertain how many students were affected.)

What academic requirements can be satisfied by internship experience? (Questionnaire B, Item #22) n=878 (92%)

Nearly all of the respondents (94%) to this item allow internships to be used to meet one or more kinds of academic requirements. Credit in the major is the most common requirement satisfied by internship experience, and is awarded by a substantial majority of 70%. This is an indication of significant departmental acceptance and, very likely, academic rigor. Respondents reported that internships can also earn General Education credit (15%) and elective credit (67%). In addition, in roughly a third (32%) of the reporting programs, internships fulfill certain requirements for graduation.

If credit is given, what is the average amount of credit awarded to students in one semester; or in one quarter? (Questionnaire B, Item #23) n=742 (78%)

Most interns earn the equivalent of approximately 1 course credit per term. Of those who specified a credit amount, 84% are on the semester system, 13% are on the quarter system, and 2% reported offering internships during miniterms.

Nearly 50% of the semester programs sponsor students for internships worth 3 credits. That percentage rises to 73% for students taking internships for 1-4 credits. <19> There is much less internship activity, however, at the upper end of the credit scale. Only 6% of the programs award semester credits in the range of 12-15 credit hours, or the equivalent of 4-5 courses. Generally, then, most students in schools on the semester system take internships as part of a regular course load or for a few credits on a part-time basis. Few participate in an internship experience full-time.

<19> Single amounts of credit (1, 2, 3, 4, and so forth) account for 83% of the credit given for semester internships, while 17% of the semester credit is reported in ranges (1-3, 4-6, and so forth) of amounts varying from 1-16. This suggests that, in most cases, the amount of credit that students can earn in internships is set in advance. Credit awarded in ranges may imply a more particularized "fit" of the amount of credit to the tasks and responsibilities of the specific internship, and students may have more freedom and flexibility in planning the experience.

Major discernible patterns in the programs that report giving credit on the quarter system show that 16% limit the award to 4 credits, the equivalent of 1 course, while the percentage rises to 57% for 1-5 credits. <20> Almost all internships offered during miniterms earn 3-4 credits, the equivalent of 1 course (students work a full 40 hour week over a period of 6 weeks).

The number of credits awarded to students takes on added meaning when juxtaposed with the number of hours per week that they work. Let us consider the situation just for semester internships. Nearly a tenth (8%) of those providing internships on the semester system (and, it might be added, on the quarter system, as well) reported that students earn no credit at all, even though they may work anywhere from 2 to 40 hours per week. But, as noted before, students in nearly half (47%) of the semester programs earn 3 credits for their internship. The number of hours worked for the 3 credits, however, varies widely, from 3 to 40 hours per week. For example, 14% of the semester programs award students 3 credits for 3 or fewer hours per week. Conversely, 12% grant students the same 3 credits for working up to 40 hours every week of the semester. The most common pattern for 3 semester credits, or the equivalent of 1 course, however, centers on 5-10 hours per week, as reported by 38% of the 3-credit semester programs. These ½ to 1½ days per week of work constitute an introduction to experiential learning and at the same time allow students to continue with a fairly full schedule of on-campus course work.

Other common patterns for 3 credits a semester involve longer internship hours: 11-15 hours per week, reported by 19%, and 15-20 hours per week, reported by 13%. Approximately 18% reported very wide ranges of hours for the semester internships (9-40, 10-20, 20-40), or simply wrote in "Varies." Regarded pessimistically, the variety potentially suggests patterns of unfairness in the hours of work required of students for a given amount of credit. Regarded optimistically, though, the variety may imply flexibility, suggesting that internships are often tailored to the needs of the individual student and the placement site.

Fluctuations in the credit-to-hour ratio persist at the higher end of the credit scale. There is wide variability in the number of hours worked among the 12% of the semester programs that award 6 credits for internship work. For example, 10% award 6 semester credits for 9 hours of work a week or less. Conversely, 17% require a full 40-hour week for the same number of credits. The most common range of hours worked for 6 semester credits is 10-20, or roughly 1½ to 2 ½ days per week, reported by 54% of the 6-credit semester progams.

<20> Single amounts of credit add up to 61% of the total, while ranges account for 39%, which may suggest that students taking internships on the quarter system have greater freedom to plan their workload than they do on the semester system.

Very few (3%) of the semester internship programs award as many as 12 credits. But almost a third (29%) of those that do award 12 credits give them for 20 hours of work per week, while more than a third (38%) award the same 12 credits for 40 hours per week. The remaining third vary greatly in the number of hours per week required for the 12 credits.

In the preceding credit-hour-to-work-hour ratios, variation is the norm, suggesting that job tasks and responsibilities may also vary considerably.

The next section includes more specific information about the tasks, responsibilities and achievements that departments and campus offices consider crucial to a high-quality internship in the humanities.

5. HUMANITIES INTERNSHIPS: AN OVERVIEW

Questionnaire B contained a series of questions designed to elicit an overview of humanities internships from those who provide students with access to them. The overview covers four areas: the ease with which "high-quality" internship placements can be found for humanities students; the characteristics of a "high-quality" internship; the reasons for programs' success and the sources of difficulty in providing students with access to internships; and the major internship issues affecting undergraduate students in the humanities. The last three issues were explored through open-ended questions that elicited a broad range of responses.

Is finding high-quality internship placements for humanities undergraduates easy or difficult? (Questionnaire B, Item #28) n=815 (85%)

About a third (37%) reported that finding high-quality internship placements is at least moderately "easy." More than half (56%), however, said that finding such placements was difficult. Another 6% reported that their experience varied. Comments suggest that both the variability and the difficulty may depend upon the institution's location relative to urban areas, the health of the economy in the surrounding area, and the creativity

that faculty are able to bring to the development of suitable placements. In the last matter, respondents have the opportunity to exercise some control over their internship situation.

What, in your opinion, constitutes a high-quality internship experience? (Questionnaire B, Item #29) n=759 (79%)

Respondents cited 19 factors, singly or in combination, that they see as decisive in determining the quality of an internship. These can best be discussed in two groups: program components and program results. Program components, which are mentioned 50% of the time, characterize a good intership by what goes into it; they refer to requirements, resources, procedures, processes and conditions that constitute the nature of the experience. Although it is sometimes difficult to make a totally clear-cut division, program results characterize a good internship by what comes out of it; they refer to the effects or the outcome of the experience as a measure of its success.

TABLE 17-A DETERMINING INTERNSHIP QUALITY (Questionnaire B, Item #29) n=759 (79%)

Components	Frequency/Percentage
Sponsor supervision	286 (38%)
Substantive tasks	288 (38%)
Integration into workplace, opportunity to see how sponsoring corporation or organization operates	60 (8%)
Variety of tasks	51 (7%)
School supervision or monitoring	52 (7%)
Pre-internship planning	38 (5%)
Good students	33 (4%)
Good sponsors (e.g., important corporations or organizations)	34 (4%)
Well worked-out learning plans or contracts	15 (2%)
Post-internship assessment by students	10 (1%)
Total number of comments entered	867

Sponsor supervision and substantive work are the factors regarded as most crucial to the quality of the internship experience, whether it is evaluated in terms of components or results. The focus is on the quality of the student's daily work experience at the placement site. Close sponsor supervision insures individual attention for the student at the workplace and cooperation with the school's goals for the experience. The assignment of substantive tasks means that clerical and "go-fer" work are kept to a minimum and, again, that the school's serious objectives in organizing the internship are respected. It is noteworthy that a number of schools cited not only

substantive tasks but a variety of tasks, which in turn enables students to get an overview of the sponsoring organization and the way it operates (itself a criterion selected by 8% of the respondents). Surprisingly few (7%), however, noted faculty monitoring—their own supervisory role—as a determinant of internship quality. (We shall see that the number who referred to their own supervisory role virtually doubled in responses to Item #30, which asks about the reasons for success in individual internship programs.)

Among program results alone, the highest-ranked single indicator of internship quality is "integration of academic theory with practical experience." This suggests that in evaluating internship quality, nearly a third have their eyes on the question of how academic training in the humanities can be integrated with or applied to life and work off campus.

TABLE 17-B DETERMINING INTERNSHIP QUALITY (Questionnaire B, Item #29) n=759 (79%)

Results	Frequency/Percentage
Integration of academic theory with practical experience	220 (29%)
Hands-on work experience	216 (28%)
Increased student employability, career preparation	84 (11%)
Development of specific job skills	72 (9%)
Career exploration	68 (9%)
Sharpening of academic skills, acquisition of academic content—intellectual challenge	126 (17%)
Student maturation	43 (6%)
Student pay or stipend	19 (3%)
Equal profit by intern and sponsor	24 (3%)
Total number of comments entered	872

These figures support data reported earlier in the study showing the importance of the vocational purpose to those who provide humanities students with access to internships. Here, taken as a group, vocational criteria for determining that an internship has been of high quality account for most of the "result" comments. Vocationally satisfying results, indicated singly and in combination, were expressed as student's hands-on work experience related to the major, increased employability or marketability, development of specific job skills, and career exploration.

Cited by 17% of the respondents, academic and intellectual challenge account for 14% of the "result" comments offered to explain internship quality. "General maturation of student" and "Student pay" were noted less often.

What has made your department's experience with internships a successful one? (Questionnaire B, Item #30) n=732 (77%)

In evaluating internship quality (Item #29), roughly a third of the respondents emphasized sponsor supervision, substantive work tasks, integration of academic theory with practical experience, and hands-on work experience. They answered this question about the reasons for program success quite differently, emphasizing good students and faculty supervision.

Respondents noted 28 program components and results that, singly or in combination, have made their departments' internship programs succeed. Components accounted for 76% of the answers, results for 24%. Miscellaneous other comments included the observation by a few (5%) that their departments' experiences were not yet or not particularly successful.

TABLE 18-A REASONS FOR SUCCESS IN INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS (Questionnaire B, Item #30) n=732 (77%)

Components	Frequency/Percentage
Good students	190 (26%)
Faculty support, faculty participation without compensation	118 (16%)
Support from (local) businesses, contacts	114 (16%)
Sponsor supervision	112 (15%)
School supervision or monitoring	92 (13%)
Selectivity regarding internships proposed or in the matching of student and internship	82 (11%)
Support from school administration	42 (6%)
Support from or coordination with central office	44 (6%)
Pre-internship planning	39 (5%)
Good sponsors (e.g., important corporations or organizations)	29 (4%)
Well-organized, well-run program (all-purpose testimonial)	26 (4%)
Support or assistance from alumni	12 (2%)
Well worked-out learning plan or contract	13 (2%)
Program kept small	14 (2%)
Public relations, high visibility for program (on campus and off)	10 (1%)
Internship is a requirement	7 (1%)
Support from grants	3 (.4%)
Total number of comments entered	947

A quarter (26%) of the respondents cited good students as the reason their programs succeed, more than cited any other factor of success. Support from faculty and from sponsoring businesses and organizations was also singled out by respondents in substantial numbers (16% each). Fewer respondents (6%), attributed their success to support or assistance from a central office on campus. Possibly many central offices experienced a sense of modesty that kept them from making this comment. But the scarcity of this remark (n=44) <21> in the item's open-ended returns also suggests that in the main, departments see themselves, not campus offices, as responsible for the success of humanities internship programs, regardless of how the tasks of administering the programs may have been shared. Support and assistance from alumni too, noted by 2%, are a small but imaginative part of the success story.

When respondents evaluated internship quality (Item #29), they emphasized sponsor supervision and downplayed faculty supervision. When they evaluated program success, however, nearly twice as many as before (92 to 52) pointed instead to their own supervisory role. In addition to the 16%, already mentioned, who cited faculty support and participation without compensation, respondents also claimed responsibility for the success of their programs indirectly, as when they emphasized their selectivity regarding internships and the care they take to match the right student with the right placement (11%).

<21> In the Questionnaire B survey sample of 955, 237 returns came from central offices, so that even if all 44 comments in praise of assistance from a central office had come from central offices themselves, they would still not represent more than a fifth of such offices that could have made such a comment. At the very least, it means that a very small percentage of the 718 departments in the "B" group made this comment.

Respondents evaluated the success of their programs in terms of results as well:

TABLE 18-B REASONS FOR SUCCESS IN INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS (Questionnaire B, Item #30) n=732 (77%) <22>

Results	Frequency/Percentage
Hands-on work experience (related to the major)	59 (8%)
Increased student employability, career preparation	61 (8%)
Career exploration	28 (4%)
Integration of academic theory with practical experience, application of academic knowledge	38 (6%)
Sharpening of academic skills, acquisition of academic content—intellectual challenge	34 (5%)
Student maturation	21 (3%)
Equal profit by intern and sponsor	18 (2%)
Student excitement when returning to campus course work	14 (2%)
Campus-community relations strengthened	9 (1%)
Increased student interest in department, retention of majors	7 (1%)
Student pay or stipend	7 (1%)
Total number of comments entered	296

Vocation-related criteria, including hands-on work experience, career exploration and increased student employability, account for a much smaller number of the comments offered on internship program success than on internship quality. The differences that emerge in the way respondents define a high-quality internship and a successful internship program are as might be expected, given the change in perspective, but are still worth summarizing. In talking about internship quality, respondents emphasize on-the-job supervision, important tasks, and integrative and vocational opportunities. In talking about their own program successes, respondents emphasize the quality of student interns, contacts with businesses and organizations, and their own role in shaping and supervising the internship experience, even without compensation.

<22> Percentages for this table and the ones that follow add up to less than 100% because the open-ended comments that have been clustered together here for discussion as sub-themes were noted by fewer respondents than answered the item overall.

What difficulties have you encountered in sponsoring or providing students with access to internships? (Questionnaire B, Item #31) n=647 (68%)

A logical balance to the preceding question about a program's strengths and reasons for success is supplied by this question about a program's sources of difficulty. Significantly fewer respondents, however, answered the question, although it is difficult to say whether that is because they were unsure of the answers, they had no major difficulties to report (as, indeed, a number of respondents actually commented), or they had reservations about communicating them. Exclusive of miscellaneous other comments registered by 10% of the respondents, the answers, noted singly and in combination, fell into three groups: difficulties related to the attitudes of the key players, cited 29% of the time; difficulties of process, cited 17% of the time; and resource difficulties, cited 55% of the time. As before, there is some overlap in these categories, but they reflect real and useful differences in the kinds of difficulties encountered by those who provide humanities students with access to internships.

TABLE 19-A PROGRAM DIFFICULTIES (Questionnaire B, Item #31) n=647 (68%)

Attitudes	Frequency/Percentage
Student resistance	116 (18%)
Employer resistance	55 (9%)
Faculty resistance	53 (8%)
Administration resistance	28 (4%)
Relating the major to careers, the "real world"	14 (2%)
Total number of comments entered	266

When discussing the next question (Item #32) about major internship issues in the humanities, respondents focused on the relation of studies in the humanities to vocationalism on campus and the world of work off campus in 32% of their answers. The fact that so few (2%) of those commenting on program difficulties said that they have trouble with this relation suggests that humanities programs have learned to bring a high level of sophistication to the challenge of placing their students in the "real world." Many respondents seem to have reached a sense of ease in their dealings with internships that enables them to provide a very finely-tuned experience, as the Boston University and Brown University case studies, among others, suggest.

To us, a big surprise in Item #31 was the relatively large number--nearly 20%--reporting that student attitudes constitute a difficulty. In the same way that students are the major asset in program success, they apparently are also a major source of program difficulty. Specifically, respondents reported that students may lack self-esteem, be poorly prepared, or be unpredictable in their interest in internships or their expectations of

the experience. Contrary to what might have been anticipated, faculty and employer resistance are portrayed here as less pressing. But if it were otherwise, the internship program could probably not have been established in the first place. Employer resistance was spelled out in a range of observations--for example, that employers see no value in the humanities, that they lose interest after a couple of years as internship sponsors, that they expect too much of students or expect the wrong things, that they are reluctant to take time out of the day to supervise interns, and that they worry about other employees resenting the interns. Lack of support from the institution and the department is generally expressed as a lack of compensation for administering internships, although relatively few (4% and 8%) focused on these problems.

Noted only 17% of the time were difficulties in the internship process: the way internships are handled either on campus or at the workplace.

TABLE 19-B PROGRAM DIFFICULTIES (Questionnaire B, Item #31) n=647 (68%)

Processes	Frequency/Percentage
Logistics--student schedules, transportation	76 (12%)
Inadequate public relations, low visibility of program (on campus or off)	30 (4%)
Faculty supervision difficult or inadequate	11 (2%)
Problems evaluating interns, inconsistencies in grading standards	16 (2%)
Program too informal	18 (2%)
Lack of credit or not enough credit for hours worked (sentiment attributed to students)	3 (.6%)
Internal politics in sponoring organization	4 (.6%)
Total number of comments entered	158

Most difficulties of process are logistical; they involve the mechanics of transporting the student to and from the placement site or fitting the internship into a student's schedule, either in a given term or in long-range planning for the degree. Surprisingly few respondents reported that faculty supervision, evaluation or lack of credit pose serious obstacles. A few indicated that more work needs to be done to promote awareness of internships among students and community organizations and businesses. Although only a very small number (.6%) mentioned difficulties growing out of internal politics in the sponsoring organization, it is worth noting this because it is an area in which interns may need extra preparation or assistance.

By far the greatest source of difficulty for our sample's internship programs was resource limitation, which accounted for more than half of all the comments made. Resources are the people, time, money and structures that make internships work.

TABLE 19-C PROGRAM DIFFICULTIES (Questionnaire B, Item #31) n=647 (68%)

Resource Limitations	Frequency/Percentage
Internship assignments not meaningful in terms of major	80 (12%)
Too few positions suitable for this major	75 (11%)
Geographic limitations: too few positions available (locally)	115 (18%)
Time constraints	74 (11%)
Lack of pay for students	71 (11%)
Insufficient funding from school	32 (5%)
Insufficient staffing	24 (4%)
Too few students for available positions	26 (4%)
Too few internships available with businesses and profit-making organizations	12 (2%)
Total number of comments entered	509

The most prevalent kind of resource limitation reported was the perceived lack of internship placements suitable for humanities majors. The problematic relation of the major to the world of work off campus appeared as a theme in almost a third (30%) of the comments on resources. Some said that it was difficult to find internships appropriate to the major (11%), while others said that even when they did locate what seemed to be suitable placements, the work did not always relate meaningfully to the major (12%). Behind these comments, however, may lie a more general problem of fully and imaginatively exploring the variety of work situations for which humanities majors are meaningfully--but not necessarily obviously--qualified.

In locating internships with less immediately apparent but equal relevance to the major, creativity is key. Two sample placements reported by our case study programs exemplify such creativity. At Bowling Green State University, a Philosophy Department intern worked as a conservationist at a municipal park on the ethics of animal management and developed a context based in ethics for the pruning of animal populations. At Boston University, a student doing an internship in history at a textile museum interviewed former textile mill workers and transcribed and edited the interviews for an oral history report for the museum.

Failure to fully and imaginatively explore work options can also intensify geographic limitations, which account for 23% of all comments made about program difficulties. Nearly a fifth (18%) of the respondents reported that the isolation or economic depression of their area makes it difficult to find placements. And, indeed, the required start-up efforts may be daunting. Yet it seems likely that virtually wherever there are businesses, organizations or agencies, it is possible to carve out an area of work that can be shaped to make it relevant to the humanities.

In reporting on other resource limitations, 4% of the resondents pointed to insufficient staffing and roughly another tenth commented that their work on internships is extremely time-consuming and that they have far too little time to develop contacts or monitor placements. It is not clear whether respondents make any connection to institutional or departmental budgeting priorities or trace these program difficulties to administration or faculty attitudes toward internships.

Approximately another tenth (11%) of the respondents said that lack of pay for students constitutes a serious resource limitation. In a related comment, a few respondents (2%) reported the specific worry that a scarcity of internship placements with companies and profit-making organizations perpetuates volunteerism among humanities professionals. None, however, explicitly registered the irony of their own positions--the lack of funding or other compensation for their own work with internships. The omission may suggest that respondents are too uncomfortable about their own volunteerism to focus on it, or that they feel that, given the budgetary and other priorities of their departments and institutions, there is no way to change the situation at the present time.

Please discuss briefly what you see as the major internship issues affecting undergraduate humanities students. (Questionnaire B, Item #32) n=628 (66%)

This open-ended question was placed last on the "B" survey instrument in order to elicit from respondents a summarizing view of the field. The fact that the item was answered by only two thirds of the 955 Questionnaire B respondents may point to the recentness with which many have become involved with internships (we saw that a quarter of the programs in the sample were established since 1980). It may also show that many of those, particularly in departments, who have been involved with internship programs even for several years may still not be (and have no need as such to be) versed in the issues and controversies of the internship field. As many of our findings suggest, internship activity across the country in the humanities is not monolithic or uniform. Respondents do not seem to have a national perspective. Programs arise out of particular departments' needs and are shaped by local pressures and opportunities, rather than by a national constituency or consensus, or by communication among colleagues recognizing common goals and challenges.

Issues offered singly or in combination clustered in four areas: internship attitudes, raised in 19% of the responses; internship program resources, raised in 23% of the responses; internship program processes and design, raised in 25% of the responses; and philosophical concerns about vocationalism and the role of the humanities in modern technological society, raised most often of all--in nearly a third (32%) of all comments.

As they did in discussing the difficulties they encountered in sponsoring internships (Item #31), respondents again focused on student attitudes in reviewing the major internship issues.

TABLE 20-A MAJOR INTERNSHIP ISSUES (Questionnaire B, Item #31) n=628 (66%)

Attitudes	Frequency/Percentage
Student attitudes	79 (13%)
Faculty resistance	68 (11%)
Administration not supportive	36 (6%)
Total number of comments entered	183

Student attitudes were singled out by 13% who reported that students are rigid, fearful, poorly motivated, unaware and, at best, unsure of what type of internship to pursue. Given the current drift toward professional training among students on most campuses, this hesitation about internships is surprising. One respondent from a Professional Practice (Co-op) Division of a large public institution in the Midwest designated as major issues: "Undergraduates who give no thought to how to make themselves attractive to employers," and "Professors who have no idea that their graduates have to go out in the world and make a living, i.e., they cannot satisfactorily answer student questions on where alumni work, how they obtained the job," and so forth. Lack of support from faculty and administration was noted by smaller numbers of respondents in the survey, however.

Internship resources such as money and placements were also included among the issues that most concern respondents. One of the two most frequently noted internship issues overall was the availability of placements related to students' majors, a concern which can partly be addressed through imaginative development of placements.

TABLE 20-B MAJOR INTERNSHIP ISSUES (Questionnaire B, Item #32) n=628 (66%)

Resources	Frequency/Percentage
Supply of internships related to students' majors	189 (30%)
School budget, funding	23 (4%)
Supply of internships (locally), geographic limitations	7 (1%)
Supply of internships in business	5 (.8%)
Total number of comments entered	224

Nearly a third of all those answering this item expressed concern about finding placements that utilize students' academic interests and training. They regard the issue as partly a problem of employers' lack of openness to humanities students; partly a problem of lack of faculty creativity (in developing or helping to shape appropriate placements); and partly a problem of lack of quality control (the difficulty of insuring that students at the placement site are assigned substantial and relevant tasks).

The question of school funding stands out as a major issue for rather few respondents (4%). It may be that many respondents view the amounts of time and money that are available for administering internships as givens, rather than as subjects of inquiry and debate. The low number concerned with the issue here and in Item #31 may also reflect the fact that in most departments, only a few and, often, only one very committed person is involved in internship activity. It seems likely that the commitment and the relative isolation of those who are involved may suppress overt commentary on this issue.

Internship program processes and design constitute an even larger area in which respondents pinpointed concerns about the field. A tenth singled out the issue of whether or not interns should be paid.

TABLE 20-C MAJOR INTERNSHIP ISSUES (Questionnaire B, Item #32) n=628 (66%)

Processes and Program Design	Frequency/Percentage
Student pay for internships	62 (10%)
Credit for internships	41 (7%)
Keeping internship in perspective	38 (6%)
Logistics: student transportation and scheduling	38 (6%)
Sponsor supervision, cooperation	29 (5%)
Faculty evaluation procedures	18 (3%)
Faculty supervision: difficult, inadequate, time-consuming	14 (2%)
Grades for internships	5 (.8%)
Total number of comments entered	245

The issues of grades and credit for internships turned out to be less important to those in the sample than internship pay. These findings coincide with earlier responses showing that 92% of those answering the question on systems of evaluation (Item #20) do, in fact, give grades and that 94% of those answering the question on what academic requirements can be satisfied by internships (Item #22) grant credit of some sort, 70% of them credit in the major. In other words, those in our sample have reached a greater degree of resolution on the issues of grading and credit than on the issue of pay. The 3% who expressed concern about evaluation procedures worry about the accuracy of grades assigned by someone not directly involved in the internship and about the legitimacy of grading work done outside of the academic process at all. Among the 6% who worried about designing programs in such a way as to keep the internship in perspective ("not letting the tail wag the dog"), there was the concern that the liberal arts curriculum could be weakened by excessive orientation toward vocationalism, but the number who expressed this concern was small.

Concern for the strength of the humanities and the liberal arts curriculum emerged not only in respondents' thinking about the proper way to design internship programs, but also, more generally, in their thinking about the philosophy behind internships.

TABLE 20-D MAJOR INTERNSHIP ISSUES (Questionnaire B, Item #32) n=628 (66%)

The Philosophy of Internships	Frequency/Percentage
Relation between the liberal arts and vocationalism on campus	235 (37%)
The relevance of the humanities to contemporary society	76 (12%)
Total number of comments entered	311

Over a third (37%) of all those answering this item focused on the relation between vocationalism on campus and liberal arts learning. A few (4%) respondents specified doubt, worry or irritation about the relation between career preparation and studies in the liberal arts. They were concerned that too much exposure to the technologically advanced, vocation-conscious larger society could jeopardize the traditional liberal arts core of a college education and dilute the strength of training in the humanities. Many more (16%) of the respondents, however, were confident about the relation. They stated that study in the liberal arts and career preparation are compatible, mutually supportive or necessary to integrate.

Those who focused on the issue of relevance believe that internships can help to demonstrate the efficacy and importance of the humanities in an increasingly technological and specialized society. Internships introduce humanities students to employers who might normally hesitate to hire them, and thus help to forge communication between the academic community and the larger society. Developed to its logical and most healthy extreme, such a connection could make it possible to break down the prevalent, socially harmful distinction between ideas and power and promote recognition that there is an essential kinship between power and knowledge, technology and morals, doing and thinking. The stereotypes produced by perceiving them as disjunctive and unrelated affect philosophy students, perhaps, most pointedly, but students in all humanities disciplines confront these stereotypes--and are uniquely equipped to challenge and transcend them.

6. SUMMARY

The importance assigned to vocationalism in respondents' evaluations of internship purpose and quality is not necessarily a discouraging sign for those concerned with the future of studies in the humanities. A desire to strengthen the impact of the humanities is evident in the fact that many of the same respondents, when commenting on the major internship issues affecting undergraduate humanities students, were concerned first and foremost with synthesis: the relation between study of the humanities and career preparation, and the role of the humanities in modern society. The severe decline in opportunities for academic employment coincides with a need in society at large that students focused on the humanistic dimensions and implications of experience are uniquely equipped to fill. Discussing the relationship between the humanities and business, Francis L. Broderick, Commonwealth Professor at the University of Massachusetts at Boston, proposes that "the study of the humanities produces individuals who understand the history and culture of modern societies, develop personal values and respect for the value systems of others . . . and exercise skill and care in communications, analysis, and dealings with others." <23> The migration of humanities students from the relative cloister of the campus to the work world off campus enables them to translate theory into practice in work that can profoundly enhance the quality of life for us all.

At the same time, internship programs have preserved the academic seriousness of the on-campus experience. For example, in the area of prerequisites for participation in internships, we saw that 85% of those responding to the question required that certain prerequisites be met. While a superior grade-point average was not consistently required, other criteria which indicate maturity of intellectual purpose were. These included junior and senior-year standing, required by 68% of those who specified that class year mattered; a minimum number of credits in the major, checked by 30% of those who discussed prerequisites; and recommendations from department members who can personally vouch for the student's motivation and competence, required by at least 11%. In addition, more respondents (26%) singled out student quality than any other reason for the success of their programs. Student quality was explained in terms of preparedness, intelligence, and motivation.

In evaluating internships, respondents by and large eschew the traditional measure of academic accomplishment, the examination, but 54% favor term papers. In addition, 95% of the programs assign grades for the internship, and nearly two thirds (63%) of these use the most rigorous system, letter grades A-F. Only a third (32%) permit students to take an "Incomplete," and almost half of those who do so limit the grade of

---

<23> Francis L. Broderick, "The Nature of the Humanities," a background paper prepared for "The Humanities and Careers in Business," an invitational conference sponsored by the Association of American Colleges and the National Endowment for the Humanities in Princeton, New Jersey, April 27-29, 1983. See "The Humanities and Careers in Business: Proceedings of the Conference," p. 9.

"Incomplete" to 1%-5% of their interns yearly. Furthermore, nearly all (94%) of the programs said that internships can be used to satisfy academic requirements, and 70% award credit in the major for the experience. The educational seriousness with which those who administer humanities internship programs regard the internship experience is further suggested by the finding that most interns earn roughly the equivalent of 1 course credit. That means that, for the most part, students do not take time off from school to work full-time at their internships; they incorporate them into the regular academic curriculum. One final indication of the educational seriousness of most programs is the finding that more respondents (38% each) cited sponsor supervision and substantive internship tasks than any other criteria in defining what a "high-quality" internship is. These are criteria which assure a high level of learning on the job.

The dedication that those in departments and central offices bring to their work with internships, however, is largely uncompensated in any terms but those of professional or personal satisfaction. Although over half of the respondents pointed to the role played by the school administration (through direct suggestion and institutional review or self-study) in the decision to establish an internship program, their subsequent remarks show that most school administrations do not follow through with material support. Nearly two thirds of the respondents (62%) reported that they receive no funding whatsoever for their internship programs, and nearly two thirds (61%) also reported that they personally receive no form of compensation for sponsoring internships: no extra salary, released time, course load credit, or service credit. Only a third (35%) receive consideration for any of the traditional forms of long-term compensation: promotion, tenure and merit pay. Moreover, because respondents, to judge by their comments, rarely associate this lack of material support and compensation with any particular source, either institutional or departmental, the problem will very likely be slow to improve.

It is, of course, quite possible that campus administrators hold back because they believe that faculty are resistant to the idea of internships. Our findings, however, indicate that there is rather little faculty resistance, at least in departments and institutions where programs have already been launched. Thus, only 8% of the respondents reporting on sources of program difficulty cited faculty resistance. And again, when commenting on the major issues affecting undergraduate internships in the humanities, only 11% focused on faculty resistance. Even on Questionnaire A, the same pattern holds true. Respondents indicated faculty disinterest 40% of the time as the reason they do not provide internship access to humanities students. But most often--56% of the time--they attributed the absence of internship activity to limited resources.

In The Humanities in American Life, The Commission on the Humanities, which was sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation to assess the humanities' place and prospects in our culture, urges that "new models of a liberal curriculum . . . accomodate the various backgrounds and goals of today's students, including their concern with careers." Faculty are key figures in this new synthesis of the humanities and the working world. Through

sponsorship of internships, they provide their majors with a tether out into this working world. It is they who can persuade students that a liberal education "must search for the connections . . . between knowledge and its uses." They can promote this synthesis by making clear both on campus and in their communication with the larger society that

> Each major branch of the humanities helps educate men and women for citizenship. . . . Science and technology transform the conditions of life in beneficial ways. They also raise serious moral and civic questions: genetic engineering; the chemical control of human behavior and reproduction; euthanasia; the distribution of space, fuel, and other diminishing natural resources; the electronic invasion of privacy . . . , <24>

to name only a few.

Faculty are uniquely positioned to have an impact. They can strengthen the perception that every critical issue upon which we will have to decide as a nation in the next decade has far-reaching social implications that students trained in the humanities are especially equipped to explore, articulate and act upon. Through work with internships, faculty help to provide these students with an optimal entry point into society. As internship sponsors, they play a direct role in assisting the humanities to find their essential place in the world of action. And by thus wedding theory and practice, they help to revitalize our functioning as a society and culture.

<24> Report of the Commission on the Humanities, The Humanities in American Life (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 66, 70-71.

CASE STUDIES

Introduction

The ten case studies that follow were selected from among the 21% of the "B" sample that sent additional descriptive materials about their internship programs. A series of telephone interviews supplemented the descriptive materials and the information provided in the questionnaires. The programs chosen as case studies reflect, though they do not statistically "represent," the range of departments and campus offices that sponsor undergraduate internships in the humanities at institutions of different types and sizes across the country. The goal in this section is to flesh out the preceding data analyses and provide some useful and provocative ideas on program practices and design for both those who now sponsor internships and those who have not yet established programs.

The case studies are organized in terms of 5 forms of access through which, the survey shows, humanities students most often take part in internships. Within the department, there are 1) ad hoc arrangements between individual department members and students, and 2) department-coordinated internship arrangements. Other frequently used forms of internship access are 3) joint arrangements by a department and a campus office, 4) institutionalized internship programs on campus, and 5) internship programs or organizations based outside of the school. The forms of access are arranged in ascending order of institutionalization.

As noted earlier, department-based internships are favored by 82% of the "B" sample in one or another form. Most popular among these are ad hoc arrangements between individual faculty members and students, and department-coordinated programs. In ad hoc arrangements, favored by 38% of the "B" sample in combination with other access channels, a student may set up an internship through any one of several faculty members. There is no set policy about who arranges the department's internships and even though one faculty member may customarily do it, the department has not reached the point of designating anyone an official administrator. Indications are that although internship arrangements in these ad hoc programs may vary somewhat from one faculty member to another, on the whole, they demonstrate an overall consistency. Ad hoc arrangements are the least institutionalized form of access and the most vulnerable. If a faculty member who has administered internships on an informal basis should leave the department, there may be no one else to assume the responsibility for some time, and whoever does it later may have to "reinvent the wheel." In department-coordinated arrangements, on the other hand, a single faculty member generally has been designated to serve as internship coordiantor or director. This may at least imply that the department has made a policy decision regarding the importance of the activity in their curriculum. Department-coordinated internships are favored by 27% of the "B" sample in combination with other forms of access.

Joint arrangements by a department and a campus office are a third major form of access to internships. For the 45% of the "B" sample who checked it, joint arrangements provide a way for departments to sponsor

internships even if they can devote little time or money to the activity. The central office, with the advantages of institutional funding, may provide many internship services, while department faculty take charge of less time-consuming evaluative work and forgo pay and released time. The central office that works with or coordinates departmental activity may be a dean's office, a career development or placement center, an office of experiential learning, or an internship office proper.

Institutionalized internship programs, a fourth form of access, have taken hold at some schools, for instance, Antioch and Kalamazoo Colleges, to such an extent that virtually all students participate in at least one internship experience before they graduate. Other schools, such as the University of Cincinnati, have institutionalized internships in some humanities fields by adding the option of a fifth undergraduate year by means of which students can earn a Certificate of Professional Practice. Short of major changes in the curriculum, however this degree of institutionalization may not be feasible at many schools. It seemed more useful, therefore, to illustrate a lower level of institutionalization, such as that provided by the Humanities Internship Program at Scripps. Such a version of institutionalization may even promote humanities internships more forcefully and, indeed, more visibly than a more generally institutionalized internship program could. Although relatively few such programs presently exist, it seemed important to include so suggestive an option.

Internship programs or organizations that are external to the institution were favored by 23% of the "B" sample in combination with other forms of access provided to students on campus. An external organization serves as an intermediary between multiple educational institutions and multiple intern sponsors. Off-campus arrangements may prove to be more advantageous than college-based internship arrangements when the number of students seeking field experience becomes greater than a faculty member is willing or able to take on without released time or other forms of compensation. In addition, the different kinds of field experience that students seek may go beyond the real interests of available faculty members and/or their immediate knowledge of potential field placements. Very often, except for a few large urban centers, students must go further and further from campus to locate high quality internships and faculty supervision may be more difficult from a distance. Internship programs that are external to the institution provide, in essence, a campus away from home and trained professionals whose full-time job it is to assist students with placements and supervise and evaluate them throughout the internship.

These five means of access do not, however, exist in pure form very often. In fact, two thirds of the programs in the "B" sample offer students multiple and overlapping access channels. For example, the internship practices of the Foreign Language Department at Purdue University-Calumet (Case Study 2) suggest a structure that is both ad hoc and department-coordinated. A single faculty member coordinates the internship activity of the department, including that of other faculty members who work with students on a more informal, ad hoc basis. The same department also exemplifies a movement toward a rather high level of institutionalization, of

the kind that is evident in Scripps' Humanities Internship Program (Case Study 8). That is, Purdue-Calumet's Foreign Language Department hopes to link up with other departments at the school to form a centralized internship program specifically for humanities students.

At the beginning of each case study, basic information on the internship program to be discussed is given in highly compressed form. This includes the name and title of the program's contact person and information on the public/private status of the institution, the size of the undergraduate student body only (given in ranges, as on the questionnaires) and, for departmental programs, the highest degree offered by that department only.

A. AD HOC DEPARTMENTAL INTERNSHIPS

1. Sweet Briar College
   Art History
   Sweet Briar, Virginia 24595
   Aileen H. Laing, Chair
   (804) 381-6125
   Private/ Under 1,000/B.A. only

Program founded: 1977
Present funding: no funds specifically allocated
Interns placed yearly: 4-5 out of 15-20 majors
Placements: .5% locally, 4% in the state, 95% nationally, .5% internationally

The Art History Department at Sweet Briar provides an illustration of a departmental internship program founded at a small school in an area of relative geographic isolation. The program grew out of a 5-year $25,000 grant from IBM secured by the director of the Career Planning Office in 1977. The purpose of the grant was to improve faculty understanding of and involvement in the student career-planning process. One fourth of the faculty chose to participate through proposals for research projects, field trips, surveys and interviews related to the subject of the grant proposal. Among them was the art history department chair, Aileen Laing, who used money from the grant over two summers to establish internship contacts at museums and galleries up and down the east coast.

Present placements, generally located between Boston and Washington, come from contacts made during these summer trips and from the suggestions of friends and colleagues at other institutions. Placements may, however, range as far away as Texas and California if the student generates her own opportunities. Since internships are taken full-time during a 4-week period in January or during the summer (with a minimum of 160 hours of work), students often return to their hometowns for the internship. (Thus, some long distance internship problems, such as travel and housing expenses, may never arise.) In such cases, the internship sponsor sets up the internship with the faculty sponsor through written correspondence.

The Art History Department has 3 faculty members as well as a chair, who rotates every three years. Art history majors may take part in

internships through other academic departments and through ad hoc arrangements with individual art history faculty. Usually, though not always, whoever is art history chair at the time advises students on internships, so that different department members may set up the internships at different times. Although the requirements from one internship to another are consistent, the department considers its program to be ad hoc precisely because there is no set policy about who administers it: any faculty member may serve as a student's internship sponsor.

Although faculty are not compensated for their work with internships, the administration at Sweet Briar is known to be very receptive to the internship idea and internships are available through all departments. The Career Planning Office assists departments by carrying lists of placements, as well as information about sponsoring agencies and organizations, and by preparing students for internships through assistance with résumés, cover letters, and self-presentation. Despite the services provided by Career Planning, however, the Art History Department does not think of itself as providing its majors with access to internships jointly with this central office.

The Art History Department defines a quality internship as a "learning experience with both intellectual and practical content." The establishment of internships was motivated above all by student interest and secondarily by faculty and administration interest. Its purpose is seen as career exploration first, followed by other vocational, academic and integrative concerns. Prerequisites for participation consist of a grade point average equivalent to at least a C, sophomore standing, and a minimum number of credits in the major. The department counsels interested students, screens them, identifies suitable work sites, assists students in securing placements (although students must take the initiative), and evaluates students at term's end. Formal learning plans are required and students are evaluated in terms of journals or diaries detailing what they have done and learned on the job; research papers such as might be submitted for a regular course; and on-site supervisors' comments. Students earn grades of Pass/Fail only and receive 3 credits (1 course) in the major or elective credit.

Roughly a fifth of the students obtain placements in business, with the rest working in nonprofit agencies or institutions; 1% are paid. One student did a paper on the restoration of a building (focusing on its past and future use) while the renovation of the building was an actual project of the Texas architectural firm where she interned. Other papers have focused on an artist who is important to a museum or gallery where an intern is working, or an artist who is featured in an exhibition that the intern helped to set up.

Professor Laing attributes the program's success to good contacts and to students' opportunities for personal growth and career exploration. Drawbacks of the program are time and financial constraints on the investigation of new internship possibilities. The potential

disadvantage of the school's rural setting, however, has reportedly not made it difficult to find high-quality internship placements for art history students. These are characterized by "interesting experiences, not just secretarial work," and by careful supervision that nevertheless permits interns the opportunity for independent work.

A. AD HOC DEPARTMENTAL INTERNSHIPS

2. Purdue University-Calumet
Foreign Languages and Literatures
Hammond, Indiana 46323
Dr. Geoffrey R. Barrow, Head
(219) 844-0520 x. 459, 393
Public/ 2,500-5,000/ B.A. only

Program founded: 1979
Present funding: no funds specifically allocated, federal grant pending
Interns placed every other year: 16 out of 40 majors
Placements: 60% locally, 35% in the state, 5% internationally

Foreign Languages and Literatures at Purdue University-Calumet provides a good illustration of a department that wants to make a humanities major more attractive on a campus that presently inclines toward business and the sciences. A branch of Purdue at West Lafayette, Calumet is a commuter school located in a highly industrialized area that is part of greater Chicago. Its first-college-generation, urban students tend to be work-oriented and the program grows out of a desire to meet that orientation and at the same time offer a core of courses in the humanities.

Department majors in French, Spanish and German may select the International Studies concentration, which requires them to take 25% of their coursework in career-oriented studies outside of the department, primarily in marketing, management and international hospitality management. Half of the department's 40 majors select this option and 80% or 16 of this group typically take part in internships.

The structure of departmental internship access for these foreign language majors is quite varied. Several of the 6 department members teach the recommended preparatory commercial language courses, which simulate work experiences in different environments. They also help to locate and supervise internship placements, but send evaluation material and other paperwork related to internships to Dr. Celestino Rufz, who coordinates the department's internships. Final approval for all internship activity comes from the department chair, Dr. Geoffrey Barrow. The department's program shares certain essential features with the department-coordinated model of internships in that standards, practices and evaluation are brought into conformity by a Director of Internships. Nevertheless, the department describes its program as ad hoc in nature (individual faculty members in ad hoc arrangements with students) because a student may approach any member of the department to sponsor an internship.

Department interest in internships was stimulated by student interest and by the substantial social contact that department members had with area businesses, contact enhanced by the location of humanities departments in the School of Humanities, Education and Social Sciences. Motivated by a desire to include the humanities in the primarily business atmosphere and by the success of internships in engineering, the school administration funded a questionnaire which Dr. Rufz composed for the local business community. The survey led to the establishment of foreign language internships in alternating years. Dr. Rufz had taught in the foreign language department for seven years before he began to coordinate this internship program in 1979.

The department has now applied to the U.S. Department of Education for a cooperative education grant. Funds would be used to expand humanities department internship programs at the school and, ultimately, merge them into a centralized internship program. Internships already exist in communications, history/political science and English, as well as foreign languages. Institutionalizing them in the form of an overall humanities internship program would, it is felt, prevent duplication of bureaucratic effort and enable humanities departments to make a stronger, more unified presentation to local businesses.

Dr. Rufz locates internship placements through newspaper ads and personal contacts (he has had off-campus experience as a translator), and through summer trips to Spain with groups of students. (Up until now, however, international placements have been the least developed part of the internship program.) In a program which features prominently the activity of both a chair and a department internship coordinator, a finely tuned reciprocal relationship between the two is probably a great asset. Dr. Rufz has a good working relationship with Dr. Barrow, who draws upon his business background to oversee the department's internship activity. Both men attend regional business meetings to increase internship contacts in the business community. In addition, the Career Development Office helps to locate roughly 25% of the department's placements.

Not all departmental majors pursuing the International Studies concentration are qualified to take internships, so it is no longer a requirement for that part of the major. Conversely, however, for those students who do want to take an internship, the GPA prerequisite is now unusually high. Prospective interns must be juniors with a grade-point average equivalent to at least a B+. Other prerequisites include a minimum number of credits in the major, extremely good foreign language skills, and an interview with the sponsor. Three quarters of the interns are placed with businesses, 20% with nonprofit organizations, and 5% with government agencies. Interns typically work 20 hours a week, a quarter of them for pay.

In addition to developing placements, Dr. Rufz counsels and screens students, giving each prospective intern an individual orientation that includes information on that intern's sponsoring company. Students are

then asked to prepare a topic for a research paper related to the work they will do. For example, a student may propose a paper analyzing the risks to the sponsoring company of investing in a particular Latin American country. This academic component of the internship may undergo modification once the student begins work. Dr. Rufz also supervises the internships; he monitors their quality through site visits and makes sure that students are doing substantive work. Ultimately, Dr. Rufz evaluates students by means of the term papers, as well as by means of journals and logs, oral reports, on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations, evaluation of required learning plans, and exit interviews. Students receive grades of A-F and earn 3 units of credit in the major or elective credit.

The administration of internships is handled primarily as an additional responsibility to teaching. Dr. Rufz receives litle extra compensation, although his work with internships does figure in merit pay evaluations. In addition, he has access to a university car for internship-related travel, and his supplies and offices expenses (mostly telephone calls) are covered. Every second year, coinciding with the internships, he receives released time amounting to 1 course (out of a teaching load of 4 courses per term).

Some typical placements have been as translator for a freight-forwarding company, social worker in a bilingual situation, assistant to a probation officer in juvenile court, and assistant in the marketing department of the Bank of Argentina. Such placements obviously satisfy vocational objectives; they also meet more strictly academic goals by providing students with opportunities to use and sharpen their foreign language skills and their knowledge of other cultures.

Dr. Barrow attributes his department's success with internships to faculty dedication and successful internship precedents, especially in the sciences, both at Purdue-Calumet and elsewhere in the state university system. In defining a high-quality internship experience, he emphasizes active faculty and sponsor supervision, hard-working students, and a system of checks and balances provided by site visits. Foreign language internships are enthusiastically supported by the department and favorably evaluated by participating students. Such difficulties as exist are traceable to the uniqueness of each placement, which puts additional pressure on already limited time and resources. In an overview of the major internship issues affecting undergraduate humanities students, Dr. Barrow emphasized the power of internships to improve the American business community's acceptance of the humanities in general and of academics in particular.

B. DEPARTMENT-COORDINATED INTERNSHIPS

3. Wayne State University
English
405 State Hall
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Jane Dobija, Coordinator
(313) 577-3324 or 577-2450
Public/ Over 10,000/ Ph.D.

Program founded: 1983
Present funding: departmental funds, corporate grant
Interns placed yearly: 33 out of 104 majors
Placements: 100% locally

The department-coordinated internship program in English at Wayne State University has grown dramatically in its one year of operation. The program is noteworthy for a wide variety of placement opportunities and for ongoing development of its intellectual component. Activity is administered by an Internship Coordinator, Jane Dobija, who last year received 1 course of released time each term (out of a 3 course load) for her work with internships. This year, she will have 2 courses released each term: the first for coordinating internships and the second for teaching a newly developed concurrent academic seminar that will be paired with each term's internships. The whole will be called the Internship Practicum and will be worth 3 credit hours (1 course). Professor Dobija is the only person involved in internships in a department of 67 full-time and up to 30 part-time faculty, although majors participating in internships can also link up with staff in the university's Co-op Education Program. The department's attitude toward internships seems to be a friendly skepticism.

Factors that played a role in the decision to offer students internships included the desire to retain majors; student and faculty interest; suggestions from the administration, including those arising from institutional self-study; and requests for student interns from local employers. The purpose of internships is seen as primarily integrative and vocational: to help students integrate academic theory with practical work experience and to make students more employable. The program began with $10,000 of start-up funds from the Gale Research Corporation, a locally based publisher of reference books. The money was used mainly for salaries. Additional monies were funneled into the program by the department as needed.

Professor Dobija taught in the department two years part-time and one year full-time before beginning to work with internships. She comes from a journalism and professional writing background and uses her professional contacts to help with student placement. In addition to her internship activities, she presently teaches creative writing, composition and research writing. As coordinator of the internship program, she publicizes the internships through the department newsletter, letters to all majors, and orientation sessions in which past interns describe their experiences. Prerequisites for taking part in internships consist of a grade-point average equivalent to at least a C and sophomore standing. Professor Dobija locates placements through former contacts and suggestions from other faculty; recruits and screens

students; carefully matches them with potential sponsors (she personally coordinates the hiring of each intern through interviews and telephone calls); and provides a pre-internship orientation. She also supervises the academic component of the students' experience and evaluates students at term's end on a grading scale of A-F. This past year, the academic component included three pieces of writing: a one page description of the internship work, a weekly journal of job experiences, and a final paper based upon the student's learning experiences during the internship (no outside reading was required for the paper). Students were also evaluated in terms of on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations.

The new Internship Practicum will meet once a week and require of interns a final paper that integrates reading and research with on-the-job learning. The course will focus on literary and analytic texts related to work, perhaps some anthropological texts, and works written in the workplace. Professor Dobija proposed the new course because she wanted to show that the internship could be related to course work and because she felt that she had too little contact with her interns and they had too little contact with each other. She sees the course as providing a forum in which students can discuss stimulating and unusual internship experiences as they occur. She also sees the course as providing an opportunity for her to achieve one of her most personally important goals: encouraging students to think about how work at the sponsoring institution or company can be more productive or more humane. She hopes through discussion to enable students to view the job differently, perhaps more creatively.

Students typically work 8-20 hours a week during the internship, half of them in business and half of them in nonprofit agencies or organizations. To date, interns have most often been placed in three vocational areas: public relations (for example, putting out newsletters in public or community organizations); business writing (particularly grant proposals and technical reports); and publishing (for example, magazines or the Gale Research Corporation). Internship placements available to English majors, however, range widely: public relations assistant, cultural events promoter, advertising copywriter, fundraiser, scriptwriter, filmmaker or videotape producer, grants writer, research assistant, technical writer or editor, and traffic manager (publishing and public relations skills are relevant).

Department faculty feel that all interns should be paid, but at present only 25% of them are. Most of these are positions in private corporations. Ms. Dobija has found, however, that whether or not an intern is paid has very little to do with the nature of the work or the student. It depends mainly on how enterprising the particular internship supervisor is about finding money within the company or organization.

Professor Dobija commented that a high-quality internship is determined by:

> ongoing supervision . . . as well as provision for experiences that truly challenge and educate the student. From the student's perspective, paid placements are extremely valuable. . . . While many businesses and community groups are anxious to provide internships, the majority are not willing to pay for our students' services. This is a major difficulty for our urban students who often cannot afford to spend so much time without being reimbursed for it.

In an overview of internship issues in the humanities, Professor Dobija noted:

> I am interested in seeing how our students are able to bring the critical skills they acquire as English majors into a business setting. Therefore, as coordinator of this program, I am trying to learn new ways of helping these students hold onto their "academic" perspective, without being separated from their colleagues at their placements. It seems that this is probably the best way our students can actually benefit their supervisors.

B. DEPARTMENT-COORDINATED INTERNSHIPS

4. Boston University
History
226 Bay State Road
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
Dr. John Borden Armstrong
(617) 353-2551
Private/ Over 10,000/ Ph.D.

Program founded: 1977
Present funding: no funds specifically allocated
Interns placed yearly: 9 out of 134 majors
Placements: 92% locally, 5% in the state, 3% nationally

The History Department at Boston University is a senior department, highly tenured and stable, and exceptionally comfortable with internships and other external programs. Its receptivity to external programs dates back to 1970, when the university created an interdisciplinary graduate American Studies Program that included art history, English and history. Department members worked with people off-campus and as a result found it easier to make a connection between on-campus and off-campus learning for undergraduates. Dr. John Armstrong, who coordinates the department's internship activity, feels that the experience and security of the department contribute significantly to the ease with which it houses internships and integrates them into its academic curriculum.

There is an Office of Career Planning and Placement on campus that posts placements and serves as an internship clearinghouse, and history majors may occasionally look for government or law placements there, but the History Department does not itself work with that office. It relies

instead on a department-coordinated internship program, which it finds preferable even to ad hoc arrangements because 1) Uniformity of requirements may be lacking in an ad hoc program and "What's everybody's business is nobody's business"; 2) The program would have less visibility if operated on an ad hoc basis; and 3) Students taking part in ad hoc internships would have little opportunity for group interaction. <25> With the present department-coordinated arrangement, Dr. Armstrong meets regularly with all of his interns together and they are able to share experiences.

Dr. Armstrong is the only faculty person in the 24-member department who is involved with internships. The department internship is a 2-semester course (Internship in History, HI495-496) which he teaches every year. Upper division students in history and other majors (e.g., art history and English) can take either half or both halves. Dr. Armstrong taught in the department fourteen years before becoming involved with internships, which he felt strongly should be offered. Initially, he taught the course in addition to his regular teaching load. At present, he receives course load credit: the seminar constitutes a third to a half of his teaching load.

Dr. Armstrong's field is American social history and New England history. He is acquainted with directors of historical institutions, societies and museums throughout New England and through them has built up a network of internship contacts. Since the program began in 1977, he has had 75-80 interns. Generally, he has more internships than quality students to fill them. Prerequisites for student participation consist of a grade-point average equivalent to at least a B, junior standing, and Dr. Armstrong's personal knowledge of the student or high recommendations from others testifying to the student's intelligence, seriousness of purpose and sense of responsibility. Dr. Armstrong emphasized that the best precaution against unsatisfactory internships is to know your students and seek out those of intelligence and maturity. He also emphasized the importance of knowing your sponsoring institutions, and believes that successful internships are likely to result when both students and sponsors know of the faculty coordinator's high expectations in the course.

In addition to arranging for placements and screening students, Dr. Armstrong meets with the student and institution together well in advance of the internship to define the project on which the student will work. At the beginning, middle and end of the internship, he monitors the students and institutions through telephone calls and site visits. Once

---

<25> We have seen that ad hoc arrangements are the most prevalent form of departmental internship access, as reported by 38% of the respondents. Several respondents traced their success with internships specifically to the informality of their programs. In addition, requirements in even ad hoc programs can attain a high degree of consistency. The size or resources of a department may incline it toward a more informal, ad hoc internship program structure.

a month, interns meet informally as a group to discuss their projects and other matters of common concern. At term's end, he also requires students to submit brief written evaluations of the internship and the sponsoring institution.

To evaluate his interns, Dr. Armstrong uses journals and logs, oral reports, on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations, required learning plans, and written work done for the project. Traditional papers are not required. Dr. Armstrong believes that the internship must incorporate an intellectually challenging academic component, but that this may take various forms. The only writing he uses in evaluating the student is writing done for the sponsoring institution in connection with the project. In other words, he evaluates the internship rigorously in terms of criteria growing out of the internship itself.

One sponsoring institution, the Cambridge Historical Commission, wanted to know about the construction of the subway system in the early twentieth century. The intern did original research and wrote a paper on the subject for the Commission. An intern at the Boston Athenaeum did research on Civil War photographs and then wrote a historical introduction for the published catalogue. Another intern at the Merrimack Valley Textile Museum interviewed former textile mill workers for an oral history report for the museum and transcribed and edited the interviews.

Interns work an average of 12 hours a week, two thirds of them in nonprofit placements and one third in government. None of Boston University's history interns is paid. The internship is evaluated on a grading scale of A-F and students earn 4 credits (1 course) for the semester in the form either of credit in the major or elective credit. Internships also count toward graduation.

In reviewing the factors that have made the internship program successful, Dr. Armstrong especially emphasized an attitude he calls "professionalism":

> My interns are adjured to think of and conduct themselves not just as students in a course but as [historians] in their first professional situations. In our meetings we discuss aspects of professionalism ranging from understanding institutions' administrative structures to being aware of dress codes to appreciating the importance of a really finished piece of work. Numerous interns have commented on how helpful this emphasis on professionalism was in their own experience.

B. DEPARTMENT-COORDINATED MODEL

5. Bowling Green State University
Philosophy
Bowling Green, Ohio 43403
Dr. Donald Scherer
(419) 372-2119
Public/ Over 10,000 /M.A.

Program founded: 1979
Present funding: institutional funds
Interns placed yearly: 2 out of 20 majors
Placements: 10% locally, 40% in the state, 50% throughout nation

Dr. Donald Scherer, who coordinates the Philosophy Department's internship program at Bowling Green State University, believes that the study and the issues of philosophy are strongly connected to the larger issues of society that shape our everyday lives. He sees internships as a way of establishing and demonstrating that connection. The department's orientation can be traced back to the early 1970's when the department felt that there were many social problems that philosophers had the background and the authority to address, although they were not doing so. Individual courses were added to the curriculum in the Philosophy of Death and Dying, Feminist Philosophy, the Philosophy of Punishment, and Bio-Medical Ethics. In 1976, Dr. Scherer obtained a consultancy grant for the department from the National Endowment for the Humanities; the consultant recommended that the department reorient the M.A. in the direction of applied philosophy and add internships, and also that the department's undergraduates have exposure to applied ethics and the opportunity to take internships in the senior year. The department received an NEH grant for the development of the M.A. part of the program only, but the consultant's suggestion about the undergraduate part of the major triggered the creation of an internship component.

Dr. Scherer is the department's undergraduate advisor and advises the 20 majors on many matters, one of them, internships. As Chair of the American Philosophical Association's Committee for Non-Academic Careers, he has the advantage of knowing about internships at the national level. While theoretically his position as undergraduate advisor is a rotating one, in fact he has been advising students for four years and will do so for another four. Students may also secure access to internships through a number of non-departmental means: Through other academic departments (particularly the Department of Social Work, reflecting the social service orientation that gave rise to philosophy internships in the first place); through the cooperative education office; through the Center for Educational Options on campus; and through internship programs based outside of the school (The Washington Center). Student who go outside of the department to arrange internships still see Dr. Scherer for assistance in securing the placement and relating the internship to the philosophy major. For <u>all</u> of his advising work, including internships, Dr. Scherer is given 1 course of released time per year.

Dr. Scherer does not have lists of internship placements. In fact, in the history of the department's internship program, there has been only

one repeat placement. That is because, for the most part, at the undergraduate level, the internship slot does not preexist. A position may exist in another field, for example, in social work. Or it may be fashioned by the particular student. In either case, though, through careful conceptualization of their abilities and the needs of the sponsor, students end up with an internship that relates to the philosophy major. Dr. Scherer plays a pivotal role in this process of conceptualization. He helps prospective interns identify their abilities, teaches them how to approach the company or organization for which they want to work, and helps them write the letters that explain what they, as philosophy students, are uniquely equipped to offer to the sponsor.

Prerequisites for student participation in the internships consist of at least junior standing, a minimum number of credits in the major, and the advice and consent of the undergraduate advisor, Dr. Scherer. In addition to counseling and screening students, helping them to identify work sites and assisting them with placement, Dr. Scherer also provides them with pre-internship orientation and supervises them during the internship. In the case of national placements, which constitute 50% of the department's internships, Dr. Scherer sends a standard letter to on-site supervisors explaining what the department expects interns to be able to do and informing them about the evaluation form they will be asked to fill out at the end. Then, once a week, Dr. Scherer calls the sponsor for a philosophical discussion related to the theme the student has selected for the internship. Thus, the focus is not on the mechanics of the experience but on its philosophical substance and content.

Dr. Scherer evaluates students in terms of weekly progress reports (he speaks to students by telephone), on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations, required learning plans, and term papers. He may ask for more writing, in the form of journals, from students who seem less organized and defined about their goals, adjusting the details of the internship to the individual student. The term papers focus on philosophical issues or skills relevant to the interns' work. Thus, some papers are content-oriented, some skills-oriented (focusing, for example, on how to organize an argument or present a particular issue). While some papers are closely tied to the work of the internship, others are more theoretical and depend more upon library work that the students do when they return to campus. (The paper is written between the end of one term and the beginning of the next.) Topics emerge as the internship progresses rather than being pre-planned.

Interns typically work 20 hours a week, 5% of them in business, 65% in nonprofit institutions, and 30% in government. The 5% who intern with businesses typically receive a stipend or salary. Students are evaluated on a Pass/Fail basis and receive 3 credits in the major or elective credit. Internships also count toward graduation.

At a municipal park in Cleveland, one intern worked as a conservationist in the ethics of animal management, drawing on a

background in philosophy to deal with the question of how it is legitimate, ethically, to "prune" animal populations. Another intern worked with Catholic Children's Services in Toledo, a position that is filled through the Department of Social Work. At Lutheran World Services in New York City, another intern used philosophical training in ethics to mediate between different United Nations delegations. Mediation has begun to emerge as a major theme in philosophy internships, whether at the international or the neighborhood level.

Dr. Scherer noted that philosophy students often find it difficult to make decisions about their career direction. They take philosophy because they like it, but they are uncertain about whether they want it to lead to a career in law, medicine or theology. This uncertainty also makes them indecisive about pursuing a particular internship placement, so that they often earn a degree in philosophy without having taken an internship or made any other career initiatives.

On the positive side, Dr. Scherer commented that the internship program has worked in tandem with the department's service courses in starting to build enrollment in the major back up again from its mid-70's low. Service courses include computer ethics, for computer science majors; medical ethics, for nurses; legal ethics, for pre-law majors; and courses in aesthetics, for art majors.

C. JOINT ARRANGEMENTS BY DEPARTMENT AND CAMPUS OFFICE

6. Brown University
Office of the Dean of the College
Box 1825
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Donald M. Scott, Associate Dean
(401) 863-2412
Private/2,500-5,000

Program founded: 1978
Present funding: institutional funds
Humanities interns placed yearly: 20-30 out of 40-60 in all fields
Placements: 98% locally

Brown University provides a good illustration of a school where the departmental responsibility for academic internships is shared with a central on-campus office. Most of Brown's departmental internships are coordinated through the Dean's Office and another central office called the Resource Center, which is under the jurisdiction of Associate Dean Donald M. Scott. The university defines internships as "courses which use fieldwork as a basis for examining theoretical issues in the various academic disciplines." The course is called Independent Study and is credited on the transcript in that way. Dean Scott has faculty standing (he teaches a course in the history department), which is especially helpful to him in his work with the academic component of internships.

The internship program began formally in 1978 with interdisciplinary studies (in Health and Society, Public Policy, and Environmental Studies) in which it was more apparent than in the humanities that field experiences were valuable. Most of the placements on file at the

Resource Center date back to this early period of Dean Scott's predecessor, who brought experience outside of academe to the job. In many cases, these interdisciplinary concentrations helped to maneuver internships beyond faculty resistance to non-academic work. Yet even now, Dr. Scott feels, humanities faculty are quite skeptical of internships, although most who are have had no direct involvement with the program. There is, however, an active core of supportive faculty on whom Dean Scott relies.

Within departments, internships are handled by individual faculty members in ad hoc arrangements with students. Interested students with at least sophomore standing must meet requirements which vary with specific placements and faculty sponsors. Then prospective interns undergo a challenging secondary qualification process which, in effect, requires them to develop a course around the internship. First, they must draw up a formal proposal, which includes an academic project and plans for the internship, as well as statements of support from agency and faculty sponsors. The proposal specifies what issues will be raised in the project, how the work at the host agency will relate to these issues and help the student learn about them (this part of the proposal is like a work contract), what readings will accompany the academic project (a bibliography), and how the final project will integrate the work experience and the more theoretical concerns presented in the readings. It is essential that the final project not be simply a term paper tacked on to the work experience. The school's internship material emphasizes that "more mediocre and unsuccessful internships result from the agency and academic components being mutually exclusive than from the overt failure of either part." Once the formal proposal is submitted and the student has thus declared a desire to take an internship, the subcommittee of the Educational Policy Committee, a faculty-wide curriculum committee, must approve it. In a separate decision, the department decides whether to give credit in the major for the internship. All of this takes place before the internship begins.

Dean Scott personally counsels students on internships and makes available to them through the Resource Center a listing of various placement sites. After the students have had interviews at the potential placement sites, Dr. Scott helps them secure faculty sponsors and draw up internship proposals. His main focus is the formation of the academic proposal. He then chairs the faculty subcommittee that decides whether or not to approve the student's proposal. He presently does some internship supervision through site visits and hopes that a graduate assistant who may be added to his staff this year may make more such visits. He also organizes or offers concurrent workshops roughly three times a term on such subjects as adjusting to the agency and the workplace. Or he may organize special workshops for a number of students doing similar internships. His coordination of internships means that he is the one who helps work across department lines for interdisciplinary internships and who fields any problems that arise among the three principal parties in the internship. He also publicizes the program, and

hopes this year to send a general information letter to all members of the faculty.

Dean Scott's office, with secretarial help, handles all of the paperwork for internships, including the paperwork associated with evaluations, but the faculty sponsor oversees the academic portion of the internship and assigns the grade. Students negotiate with the faculty and agency sponsors regarding evaluation procedures and the basis of grades, which may be either A-F or Pass/Fail. Internships are evaluated by means of oral reports, on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations, required learning plans, and the integrative term papers, already discussed, which the student leaves on file at the Resource Center for reference by other students, faculty, and Center staff. Some internship programs even incorporate what might be called a "town crier" feature—the intern brings back to the campus news of the world. At Dartmouth College, for example, students whose internships have been arranged through the Tucker Foundation--an on-campus Department of Interns and Community Programs--must publicly share their off-campus experiences through classroom presentations, newspaper features, Student Union presentations, and the like.

Brown University's students typically work 10-12 hours a week at the placement site, 60% of them in nonprofit agencies or institutions and 40% of them in government, none of them paid. They receive 3 credits in the major or elective credit. Typical placements are with the Rhode Island Historical Society; the Division of Public Parks; in publishing; and with nearby independent schools, where interns teach and devise programs in writing and other subject areas. Often humanities students do not take part in strictly defined "humanities internships." Non-humanities placements may be located, for example, in hospitals, banking firms or in administration, and require students to use general liberal arts skills. Yet although Dean Scott does not advocate placing students strictly by major, he emphasizes that all internships include an academic component and integrate academic theory with relevant practical experience. The integration may be accomplished by allowing the paper to make the connection between the work experience and the humanities.

Institutional funding covers Dean Scott's salary and the salary of the Coordinator of the Resource Center, who comes from a community-involvement background but has somewhat less to do with internships than Dean Scott, whose primary focus is the academic component. In addition to internships, the Center oversees volunteer activity and Work-Study. In the case of both the Associate Dean and the Coordinator of the Resource Center, work with internships is one of the many responsibilities of the job and does not appear in the budget as a line item. Compensation is specifically connected with internship work only in the case of one of the Center's Work-Study students whose sole responsibility is internships. Faculty sponsors of interns receive no compensation--work with internships is regarded as similar to overseeing an Honors Thesis or a regular Independent Study course.

C. JOINT ARRANGEMENTS BY DEPARTMENT AND CAMPUS OFFICE

7. Macalester College
Career Development Center/
Internship Program
1600 Grand Avenue
St. Paul, Minnesota 55105
Susan J. Lowe
Internship Coordinator
(612) 696-6384
Private/ 1,000-2,500

Program founded: 1972
Present funding: institutional funds, corporate grants
Humanities interns placed yearly: 35 out of 250 in all fields
Placements: 80% locally, 10% nationally, 10% internationally

"Joint arrangements" of internships at Macalester College means that every department provides students with internship access through the Career Development Center, where Susan J. Lowe coordinates the Internship Program for the entire school. At first, it was reportedly a struggle to establish credibility for internships among academic faculty, but they are now highly regarded. The enabling trade-off in this joint venture is that the program has a full-time, paid staff member who does the time-consuming work of developing placements and preparing students for internships, while faculty do less time-consuming evaluative work and forgo pay. Each department lists the internship as a departmental course offering in the college catalog, thus assuring for the activity a high degree of visibility and institutionalization.

The Internship Program began twelve years ago with a community involvement effort that included an internship and a volunteer component. In a capital campaign three years ago, alumni helped Macalester approach General Mills and the St. Paul Companies, Inc. (a local insurance company) for corporate grants that were designated, in part, for the Career Development Center. Institutional reports later recommended that the school's internship program be merged with the Center and the corporate funds became part of the Center's operating budget. The merger resulted in a greater number of internships and the creation of the full-time position of Internship Coordinator.

Some departments list their own placements and then send students to the Career Development Center, but in most cases the central office lists and publicizes the internship positions. As Coordinator, Ms. Lowe develops internship opportunities, often through suggestions from faculty and local alumni. The program is publicized through a handsome brochure and periodic breakfasts and luncheons with faculty. Ms. Lowe also attempts to develop new internship areas: computer-related, advertising, and international business. Many more requests come in than there are students to fill them.

Ms. Lowe's other responsibilities as Internship Coordinator include pre-internship orientation sessions for all prospective interns, to show them how to look for an internship; individual counseling to teach interview techniques and résumé writing; and workshops to teach students

how to write a learning contract, how to evaluate the internship at mid-semester, and so forth. She makes some site visits and coordinates mailings to supervisors and faculty sponsors. She also handles all paperwork connected with learning contracts and the evaluation and grading processes. At the end of the term, she sets up a dinner for interns and their supervisors.

Institutional funds pay for Ms. Lowe's salary and part of the Career Center budget, upon which she draws for such additional expenses as printing and telephone calls. She also administers a Work-Study component within the Internship Program: Work-Study students can choose to do an internship off campus and have 20% of their salary paid by the nonprofit organization and 80% by the school. These internship arrangements are attractive both to students and to appropriate sponsoring organizations.

Students who want to participate in internships must be of at least sophomore standing and must meet other requirements specified by the individual department. The type of internship arrangement (department ad hoc or department-coordinated) and the methods used to evaluate internships (journals and papers, for the most part) may differ from department to department and internship to internship, but students are almost always evaluated in terms of learning plans, site evaluations by on-site supervisors, and calls to the student at the placement site. Faculty receive no form of compensation for their work with internships, but they reportedly are not disturbed—they did not pursue an earlier opportunity to obtain compensation. The administration is seen as supportive and 60-70 of the school's 100 faculty members sponsored internships last year, signalling wide acceptance both of the internship concept and of current internship practices.

Interns typically work 10-15 hours a week, 40% of them in business, 40% in nonprofit agencies or institutions, and 20% in government. They earn grades A-F and Pass/Fail and are awarded the equivalent of 1 course in the major, elective credit, or General Education credit. A fifth of all interns are paid. Ms. Lowe reported that although some students experience difficulty finding internships because they lack self-confidence, most humanities majors encounter little difficulty in locating placements. But it is more difficult, she noted, for humanities majors than for students in technical and business areas to find paid internships. Not surprisingly, humanities students who do secure placements in technical and business internships are more likely to receive pay.

Additional information was available regarding foreign language internships. A variety of international firms in the Twin Cities areas (banks, export firms, companies that conduct international business) provide a ready supply of internship placements in translation and English-as-a-Second-Language Programs (for refugees coming into the area, mainly from Southeast Asia and Latin America). Foreign language students can also arrange off-campus access to internships through The Associated

Colleges of the Midwest, a consortium with a Chicago Urban Studies Program. Although many study abroad, few take internships out of the country (typically only 5 each year out of the Center's 250 placements) and, then, only during January or the summer term.

In reviewing Macalester's program, Ms. Lowe commented:

> We don't find internships <u>for</u> students; we teach them the skills necessary to develop tailor-made placements. Some students don't want to work that hard. Fewer employers pay; students need money.

One other area of program difficulty is logistical: in a few cases, faculty may wait too long to alert interested students that it is time to begin making internship arrangements.

It has already been noted that Macalester faculty are broadly supportive of internships. To assess and respond to any skepticism that may exist, however, Ms. Lowe holds periodic luncheons with faculty where she can find out what the obstacles and reservations are. This past year, she also held weekly breakfasts (one for each department in the college) to help her keep in touch with faculty sentiment on internships.

D. INSTITUTIONALIZED INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

8. Scripps College
Humanities Internship Program (HIP)
Balch Hall
Claremont, California 91711
Dr. Margaret L. Newhouse, Director
(714) 621-8000, x. 3550
Private/ Under 1,000

Program founded: 1975
Present funding: institutional funds
Humanities interns placed yearly: 16
Placements: 100% in Greater Los Angeles area

Some schools, such as Antioch and Kalamazoo Colleges, have institutionalized experiential education to such an extent that virtually every student will have a learning experience in the field before graduating. Kalamazoo, for example, advises students in its literature that "Participation in the [Career Development Internship Program] is strongly encouraged by the college, although it is not a requirement for graduation. The large majority of students do have at least one internship experience." The rationale behind the school's venture into internships includes integrative and vocational objectives and a desire to help students take greater responsibility for their education and their lives. Other schools, however, have institutionalized the internship concept at a lower but still highly visible level. One of the most innovative and intellectually challenging of these ventures is an institutionalized experiential learning program developed by Scripps College specifically for humanities students. It is virtually full-time and includes an academic seminar taken by students concurrently with the internship.

Among the several Claremont Colleges, which all, except for Pomona, have a specialty, Scripps emphasizes the humanities. It is an all woman's college and since more and more women are preparing for careers, the school felt it would be wise to include a vocational option as part of the academic curriculum. There are several kinds of internship opportunities available now at Scripps. For example, summer internships for pay are offered by the Career Planning Office. Students can also convince faculty to give them credit in ad hoc internship arrangements that place them in field experiences through American University's Washington Semester or UNESCO, or they can design their own field experiences. But the Humanities Internship Program (HIP) is the only credit-bearing internship program at the college.

The program began in 1975 with a three-year grant from the Mellon Foundation which was part of a larger proposal put forward by the five Claremont Colleges. Over the years, faculty from academic departments, principally English and history, have occasionally co-taught the HIP seminar, which is interdisciplinary, but the relation is informal and the HIP program is not run jointly with departments. Since HIP is an autonomous academic program, department members do not serve as faculty sponsors for HIP interns. Credit in the major depends upon approval from the relevant department chair or advisor, but without departmental supervision or additional evaluation. Neither does Dr. Margaret Newhouse, the HIP Director, teach in any department, although her training is in political science. Her half-time position involves administration and teaching within the HIP program only.

The program accepts approximately 16 students a year (out of a student body of roughly 500) for a spring semester internship. Entry is competitive and the program has a somewhat elite reputation on campus. Prerequisites for participation consist of a grade-point average equivalent to at least a B-; sophomore standing; humanities courses two previous semesters; and personal maturity, dependability and motivation, as evidenced in an interview that is part of the internship application process.

With help from Associate Director Patricia Ruth, who is also half-time, Dr. Newhouse develops and maintains lists of placements and offers placement assistance to students. She receives internship suggestions from Scripps alumnae, other faculty, the Career Planning Office, and students themselves. Her network of contacts is further enhanced by the fact that although she has not worked off campus, she knows many people in the area. Placements tend to be highly individualized: they are selected in terms of the student's career interests, temperament and/or major, if the student sees the major as important to her career. For the college, the main purpose of internships is the integration of academic theory with practical application. From the student's point of view, the principal goal may be career exploration (for instance, an English major may want to explore a career in law).

Dr. Newhouse's responsibilities also include monitoring and evaluating the internship. She makes one visit to each placement site during the internship and the associates (internship sponsors) visit the college twice during the term, for a social event at the beginning and a dinner and academic presentation at the end. At each academic presentation, three students deliver oral versions of their projects. Dr. Newhouse also meets with interns one evening a week throughout the internship, following a group dinner, to provide a forum for discussion, films, guest speakers, panels (which include past interns), and the presentation of required weekly issue papers.

Another of her responsibilities is outreach. Dr. Newhouse speaks off campus to trustees, alumnae and other groups about the program. She also works with the development and admissions offices on campus. Her coordination with the administration in this way helps to show businesses that Scripps is preparing women for work and helps to make the school more attractive to prospective applicants.

Ultimately, Dr. Newhouse evaluates students on the basis of required learning plans and evaluation forms that she sends to associates at midterm and again at term's end, and students usually see these evaluations. They receive grades of Pass/Fail for the work component of the internship and can use the experience to gain elective credit. Typically interns work 16-20 hours a week, 65% in business, 30% in the nonprofit sector, and 5% in government at placement sites in the Greater Los Angeles area. Internships are non-salaried, although students are generally reimbursed for a portion of their transportation expenses.

The work component, however, is only one of three parts of an HIP internship. Two other components, the independent project (a term paper) and the interdisciplinary seminar, each count as the equivalent of a course, making the total internship experience virtually full-time. Students may petition for credit in the major if the independent project and their work relate to the major. And they may also receive humanities credit (roughly the equivalent of General Education credit elsewhere) for the academic seminar. Both academic components of the internship experience are evaluated with grades A-F.

The syllabus for the interdisciplinary course, which changes each year to meet the interests of faculty and students, includes such texts as Studs Terkel's Working, Freud's Civilization and Its Discontents, Marx's "On Alienated Labor," Barbara Ehrenreich's The Hearts of Men, Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique, Sissela Bok's Lying, Orwell's 1984, Arthur Miller's Death of a Salesman, Mary Shelley's Frankenstein, Dickens' Great Expectations, Ursula Le Guin's The Dispossessed, as well as selections from Ruskin, Thoreau, and J.K. Galbraith and many other writers. The course is generally team-taught by two to three people (Dr. Newhouse and department faculty) and centers on discussion and the writing of 6 papers on the required readings. The purpose of the course is to provide historical and cultural perspectives on work and

work-related issues. There are also weekly issue papers in which students evaluate their job experiences and relate them to the broader issues raised in the seminar. These brief analytical papers have replaced the journal, which Dr. Newhouse felt had become merely descriptive in the hands of most students.

The independent project is a disciplined examination of some humanistic issues confronted in the work situation. Projects are normally based upon both library and on-the-job research and where relevant, bibliographies are submitted with project proposals. Each project is first presented orally to the group and then turned in as a final paper (usually 15-20 pages long). The following sample paper titles reflect the variety of students' majors and internship placements: 1) "Criticizing the Critics: A Review of the Los Angeles Times Book Review," written by a comparative literature major; 2) "The Implications of Self-Help Books Published by J.P. Tarcher, Inc.," written by a British literature major; 3) "The Social Function of Taverns from the Medieval Period to the Present," written by a major in British and American literature; 4) "Artificial Intelligence: A Conflict of Mycin Men," written by a major in British and American literature; 5) "Notions of Emergency and Responsibility in a Health Care Situation," also written by a major in British and American literature; 6) "The Social Role of a Small Museum," written by an American studies major; 7) "Art and Environment in Downtown Los Angeles," written by an art history major; 8) "Public Assistance and Poor Chicanos in Pomona, California, 1979," written by a Latin American studies major; and 9) "The Fusing of Theology and Political Activism: The Theology of Liberation and American Social Movements," written by a history major. It is evident from these titles that so-called "humanities placements" are often defined quite creatively and that the paper plays a crucial role in integrating the work of the internship with the academic component.

At the end of the internship, students extensively evaluate all aspects of the HIP program.

Among the difficulties encountered in the HIP program, Dr. Newhouse cited that of obtaining partial transportation reimbursement for students and of financing dinners and related social events. The institution funds the program, which is very costly, and that is one reason the program has remained small. Dr. Newhouse also noted that student schedules sometimes cause problems for employers who need interns full-time, not just for 2-3 days a week. In a few cases, employers may also have computer needs or needs for practical skills (e.g., drafting) that not many liberal arts majors can meet. Dr. Newhouse commented that on the whole, however, employers appreciate the liberal arts background of the interns, and finding high-quality internship placements for humanities majors is usually relatively easy.

E. INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS BASED OUTSIDE OF THE SCHOOL

9. The Washington Center
1101 14th Street, Northwest
Twelfth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Dr. James M. Heffernan
Executive Director
(202) 289-8680
Private/ Nonprofit/Under 1,000

Program founded: 1975
Present funding: tuition and grants from corporations and foundations
Humanities interns placed yearly: 100 out of 750 in all fields
Placements: 100% in Greater Washington, D.C. area

Since it began operations in 1975, the Washington Center, a nonprofit educational organization, has placed 7,000 students from more than 500 colleges and universities across the nation in internship positions in all fields in Washington, D.C. The Center also offers two-week special topic symposia for undergraduates in all majors. In 1982, with the help of a grant from the MacArthur Foundation, the Center added a humanities component to its undergraduate internship program and, at present, roughly 15% of the Center's interns each year are humanities majors.

The Center offers undergraduates an academic internship program with realistic field experiences, hands-on responsibilities, substantive assignments, one-on-one supervision and evaluation, career guidance, and exposure to one of the country's leading employment markets. The placement process is a negotiated one in which the Center acts as an agent for the student and the student's home institution in establishing contact with potential internship sponsors. Students remain enrolled at their home institutions while taking part in the Center's program, but the Center coordinates all internship activity, supervises and evaluates students, conducts weekly required seminars and discussion groups, and provides housing and support services. The Center thus provides a structure within which students far from their home institutions can take part in supervised work-and-learning experiences that have been individually tailored to their academic backgrounds and their professional aspirations. Washington Center internship experiences are full-time and students typically receive 9-12 college credits for working 35 hours a week at the placement site and 3 college credits for academic work in the weekly seminar.

Before applying to the program, a student of at least junior standing must confer with an on-campus Institutional Liaison, a person at the home institution who has worked with the Center, in order to determine the amount and kind of credit, the basis for grading, and all other internship requirements. Once accepted into the program, students indicate the kinds of placements they would prefer in terms of their interests, background, training and/or career goals. Program Associates at the Center carefully match student requests with descriptions of available placements and, as a rule, offer students at least four placement options. The particular placements students have selected are then confirmed and set up before they arrive in Washington.

One fourth of the interns overall typically secure placements in business, 15% in nonprofit agencies, and 60% in government. A tenth of the interns are paid and from 8%-12% receive Center scholarships. Sample placement sites for humanities majors include the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Kennedy Center, the Corcoran Gallery of Art, the National Archives, the Library of Congress, the Folger Shakespeare Library and the Folger Theatre, the American Folklife Center at the Smithsonian, the Woodrow Wilson International Center, the Hispanic Link News Service, and the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, as well as placements on Capitol Hill. Many internships are also available in the areas of business, consumer affairs, international relations, labor, education and in special interest organizations and associations. Sponsors receive students on the understanding that the internship is, above all, an educational experience for the student, not a way for them to obtain low-cost labor.

Washington Center Program Associates develop and certify internship placements, assist students in securing placements, provide them with pre-internship orientation, help them write the required formal learning contracts, counsel and supervise them during the internship, help resolve any placement problems that may arise, and evaluate students at the end of the internship. The 10 Associates are full-time professionals specifically trained for this work by the Center. They monitor student progress at the workplace through three on-site performance evaluation sessions with each student and internship sponsor. The sponsor recommends a final internship grade based upon student performance in the placement, which is revealed in the evaluation sessions with the Program Associate and the student. Associates direct the evaluation process and submit their own final evaluations of the students. Seminar faculty evaluate student performance in the required weekly seminar and submit a final grade for each student. Seminar and internship grades of A-F are then sent to on-campus faculty, who assess the grades and award credit at the home institution on the basis of all program assignments and evaluations.

Each intern is required to enroll in one of the Washington Center's academic seminars to complement the work component of the internship. Seminars are discussion-size groups (limited to 15 students) that meet one evening a week. Instruction is provided by experts who are themselves practitioners in the field under study. The effectiveness of these adjunct faculty derives from the fact that they are not traditional academic instructors, while all have strong academic backgrounds and some teaching experience. Seminar faculty include lawyers, senior agency executives, congressional staffers and policy analysts.

Each seminar is designed to explore a particular subject of intellectual inquiry related to students' internships, and to serve as a forum for the integration of academic theory and practice. "Business and Ethics," "Arts and the City," "Political News Reporting," "Trial by Jury," and "Latin America and International Politics" are among the

sixteen to twenty seminars taught each term. Reading and writing assignments are required for all seminars, as is some practical experience (e.g., attendance at exhibitions, congressional hearings, press conferences, and so forth) related to the seminar topic.

Program Associates also set up a full schedule of co-curricular activities that supplement the work experience and seminar. Throughout the internship period, students attend lectures featuring prominent public figures in government, business and culture, as well as social and cultural events that enrich their personal experience. Regular offerings include a Monday Night Speakers series, Capitol Hill Breakfasts, Brown Bag Lunch discussion groups, agency site visits and briefings, and visits to local cultural institutions, such as the Smithsonian and the Museum of African Art.

More than half of the institutions whose students take part in internships through the Center pay the program fees from student tuition and/or campus financial aid. Others have special funds and waivers to help subsidize Washington costs. Through corporate and foundation grants, the Center also offers a limited number of scholarships to minority and other applicants. Center programs are available year-round. For the fall and spring semesters (15 weeks each), the program costs $960; program costs for summer session and winter and spring quarters (10 weeks each) are $840. The Washington Center also provides housing for students; the centrally-located facility includes furnished apartments with full kitchens.

In discussing what constitutes a high-quality internship experience, the Center's Executive Director, Dr. James Heffernan, pointed to conscientious supervision; a high level of work assignments and responsibility at the placement site; and students' commitment to, and readiness to benefit from, the internship. He commented that agency sponsors in Washington need interns and hence provide good mentoring and stimulating assignments. Good relationships with campus faculty are also central to the success of the program. Dr. Heffernan emphasized the value and credit-worthiness of experience-based learning and underscored the educational and professional importance of an internship as part of a student's course of study.

E. INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS BASED OUTSIDE OF THE SCHOOL

10. The Great Lakes College Association
Philadelphia Urban Semester
1227-29 Walnut Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
Stevens E. Brooks
Executive Director
(215) 574-9490
Private/Nonprofit/Under 1,000

Program founded: 1968
Present funding: institutional funds
Humanities interns placed yearly: 28 out of 200 in all fields
Placements: 100% in Philadelphia

The Great Lakes College Association (GLCA), founded in 1961, is an academic consortium of 12 independent liberal arts colleges: Albion, Antioch, Denison, De Pauw, Earlham, Hope, Kalamazoo, Kenyon, Oberlin, Ohio Wesleyan, Wabash and Wooster. Since 1968, the Philadelphia Urban Semester has provided 2,500 students from GLCA's member colleges, as well as liberal arts students from other colleges and universities across the nation, with a structured learning experience of an academic and experiential nature within the urban environment of Philadelphia. Of the 200 undergraduates typically placed each year, 14% are humanities students (in English, history, art history and philosophy). Students remain registered at their home institutions, but pay the term's tuition to GLCA for 16 semester hours of credit (4 courses). Program components consist of the field placement, where students work 4 days a week; the required City Seminar, which meets 1 day a week; and an elective seminar, which meets 1 evening a week. All supervision and evaluation are done by Urban Semester faculty.

Students with at least sophomore standing, a minimum grade-point average equivalent to a B, and a minimum number of credits in the major may apply to the program either directly or through faculty or administration at their schools. Staff in the Urban Semester office develop placements under the guidance of a placement coordinator. Students select and are interviewed for prospective placements after they arrive. Typically interns work 32 hours a week, 60% of them in business and 40% in the nonprofit sector. However, over two thirds of the business placements are with nonprofit organizations, for example, the business office of the Philadelphia Orchestra. Furthermore, Urban Semester faculty have found that the distinction between humanities and non-humanities internships does not hold up; students are placed according to what they want to learn, which may or may not be tied to their major. For example, a physics major may request a placement with the Philadelphia Museum of Art because it provides an opportunity to learn more about the arts.

The program has 6 full-time faculty members, most of whom have the doctorate or other terminal degrees (M.B.A. or M.F.A.). They are given special training when they arrive, and each is assigned a maximum of 20 students to supervise in the internship and to teach in City Seminars. Most have had prior experience with traditional campus-bound education and have deliberately chosen a career in non-traditional education. The

fact that one faculty member recently won an NEH fellowship for faculty development indicates that even though program faculty work outside of academe, they are regarded as academically of high quality. Roughly half of them are scholars, research and publication-oriented. The other half are practitioners (for example, a ceramicist or a performing artist). The program does not try to match faculty members' areas of expertise with students' majors or placements, however. The emphasis is on the liberal arts and on teaching students how to learn.

Faculty advisors are selected on the basis of students' personal preferences during orientation and the topic of the City Seminar that each faculty member teaches. These are academic seminars, often interdisciplinary in content, and provide a methodology for using the city as a subject of active learning. Typical seminar topics offered each term include urban art, myth and the modern city, and community and politics. A maximum of 20 students are permitted per topic, 10 in each section. Classes meet once a week for 4-5 hours, depending upon the field activity. In this "seminar day," students also discuss issues raised by their placements and have time to meet individually with their faculty advisors. Term papers are not required for the seminar, but students are assigned outside reading and might write a journal and a series of short papers.

In addition to the City Seminar, students usually elect to take one evening seminar a week. These are conducted by adjunct faculty, people working in the field, practitioners who may or may not also be academics. They are offered according to student interest and may or may not be related to students' majors. Typical evening seminar titles are Justice; Communication and Community; Women and Social Policy; New Styles in Management; The Form of the City; and Performing Arts. As with City Seminars, students prepare outside reading and writing for this course.

At the end of the internship experience, faculty evaluate and grade students' total program performance on a scale of A-F in terms of site visits and calls to the intern, on-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations, evaluation of required learning plans, exit interviews, course work and any other evaluation material that may have been agreed upon with Urban Semester faculty. Depending upon arrangements made with each participating college, students earn credit in the major or in an interdisciplinary field, or elective credit. As a form of post-internship assessment, students meet one-to-one with Urban Semester faculty and fill out a post-internship learning plan showing what courses or further kind of study they intend to pursue, whether they plan a change of major, and what skills they have still to learn to achieve their goals.

To supplement the work and academic components of the program, Urban Semester faculty and staff also offer students special workshops and colloquia. All students take computer and writing workshops. Colloquia topics have included "Social Issues: The Philadelphia Mayoralty Race 1983" and "Managing a Small Nonprofit Organization." In addition,

students avail themselves of the wealth of cultural and social resources in Philadelphia and at the 70 colleges and universities in the area. Recently, they have also had access to a job bank where alumni and friends advertise positions.

Tuition for the program is about the same as it is at a GLCA college, $2,970 for fall or spring semester (16 weeks), housing not included. The usual arrangment is that students enrolled in the GLCA program pay no tuition at their home institutions, or perhaps pay just a maintenance fee, although they retain their campus status. Students generally rent apartments in Philadelphia during the internship, which is feasible, since, with so many schools in the area, the turnover in housing is very high.

Reviewing the major internship issues confronting humanities majors, Executive Director Stevens Brooks noted that "Faculty and parents misguide students, who then believe that business r rely wants humanities students at entry level." Commenting on the GLCA program in Philadelphia, he added that the city is its own worst enemy. Perceived as a stepchild to New York in the arts and to Washington, D.C. in politics and government, Philadelphia, he believes, offers a wealth of untapped resources for students interested in internships.

PRINCIPLES OF GOOD PRACTICE

It is not likely that recommendations from an external report such as this can affect the problem of resource limitations that respondents cite most often as a difficulty, whether they do or do not sponsor internships. This section therefore focuses on faculty practices and attitudes, an area in which such recommendations can more readily make a difference. Suggested below are some techniques that are generally adaptable by humanities faculty members who wish to help their students learn experientially.

The principles of good practice that faculty use in the classroom carry over into the field of experiential learning. Such components of traditional learning as faculty supervision, student reflection on the learning process, and faculty evaluation of student learning re-emerge in two themes that are central to experiential education: "articulation" and content-accountability. "Articulation" is the integration of the internship into the student's overall course of study. Content-accountability means that the learning goals of the internship are spelled out, often in connection with or as an extension of the articulation process, and that ways of verifying these goals are established.

It seems likely that experiential learning will have the best chance for wide acceptance among humanities faculty when internships are strongly and convincingly linked to the teaching curriculum. In a jointly sponsored publication, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education (WICHE), a thirteen-state educational association that surveyed regional internship practices, and the Council for the Advancement of Experiential Education (CAEL), one of the two major professional organizations in the field of experiential learning, advise that

> Experiential education components . . . are [generally] part of a larger academic program, whether that be the core curriculum, a specific academic major, or a sequence of professional courses. . . . In an "articulated" internship, . . . learning must bear a close relationship to the larger learning and career goals of the student's academic program.<26>

Articulation can take place whether the student makes arrangements for the internship through a department or a campus office. The WICHE-CAEL Casebook notes that

> Those programs that have originated from faculty initiative have the strongest articulation, because faculty "own" the programs and because faculty understand the relationship between components of a curriculum and how internships can

---

<26> Holly Zanville and Richard Markwood, A Casebook on Practice in Internship Education (Boulder, Colorado: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1982), p. 15. Subsequent references to the Casebook appear in the text.

> be integrated. . . . Programs in which faculty are not instrumental in designing internships that fit into an overall pattern of courses [for example, programs arranged through a central office on campus] can accomplish the same end by developing a process in which the student and his/her faculty advisor individually relate the internship to a larger pattern of course work. (pp. 20, 21)

Articulation is likely both to enhance an internship program's chances of academic acceptance and to further its "institutionalization," its establishment as a valued and enduring component of the curriculum. Institutionalization is vital to ensure that programs do not have to start over again each time there is a turnover in faculty administering the program, whether because someone has left the department or because lack of compensation or time constraints have forced the person involved with internships to abandon the work. Yet it is also possible for an internship program to become over-institutionalized within an academic department, although not many departments have reached that stage of concern. A problem might arise, for example, if a department had an overly specialized idea of what constitutes a suitable internship for that major and restricted student participation to fit just a few patterns. Or the program might become over-institutionalized if it were assigned an established course number and appeared every year pro forma in the college catalogue, but had no particular department member(s) to champion its visibility among the majors. It is probably best, therefore, for the longevity and educational distinctiveness of internship activity if some central office or member of the administration at the institution oversees program development and evolution.

Content-accountability becomes a particular issue when educational programs are located away from campus or when the day-to-day presence of traditional instructors is impractical or inappropriate. To assure educational quality and then secure widespread faculty recognition and acceptance under such conditions, it is essential to "clarify intended outcomes [of the internship], and to do so in assessable form."<27>

Learning contracts or formal learning plans provide both a way to formalize internship objectives and grounds for assessing their achievement. Often signed by all three interested parties--the student, the faculty sponsor and the workplace supervisor--the contract clarifies the internship's articulation or "fit" into the student's overall academic program by specifying the kinds of learning the student expects to accomplish, the methods by which the learning will be achieved, and the procedures by which the learning will be evaluated. If the contract is used to assess the learning that has, in fact, been achieved by the end of the internship, it becomes an instrument of accountability. Over three fourths (77%) of those who responded to the Questionnaire B item about formal learning plans or

---

<27> Morris T. Keeton, "Assuring the Quality of Educational Programs," in Learning by Experience--What, Why, How, eds. Morris T. Keeton and Pamela J. Tate (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass and CAEL, 1978), p. 40.

contracts reported that they are required of each intern, and roughly half who commented on means of evaluating interns cited the evaluation of these contracts. Often there is also a field-service contract in which the placement sponsor is asked to specify, ahead of time, the type of work the intern will be doing, thus assuring commitment at the placement site to the learning the student has formalized as a goal.

Papers and term papers are critical in verifying internship learning and helping to define its relationship to the student's course of study. Over half (54%) of those who answered the Questionnaire B item about mechanisms used to evaluate student internship performance reported using term papers. A number of the respondents who shared their experiences with us as case studies, however, emphasized that papers should grow out of the internship and its experiential nature, and not be simply a traditional course assignment tacked onto an untraditional learning experience.

In this respect, evaluation of products prepared for the internship can be an ideal solution. Such products as newsletters and introductory essays to exhibition catalogues, for example, can provide primary "evidence" that traditional knowledge and skills have been enhanced during the internship and that new learning has taken place. As noted earlier, while only 3% of those who responded to the questionnaire item about methods of evaluation took the trouble to add the comment that they evaluated students in terms of material produced for the internship organization, the number who actually do so is probably much greater.

Term papers and projects can also be key in freeing students from the difficulty of having to secure narrowly defined humanities internships, or internships defined strictly in terms of the major. The papers and projects may be used as bridges, to make the connection back to the major, if that is desired.

Another creative way of forging articulation or connection between the internship and the student's overall curriculum is through a concurrent course (some programs instead require courses to precede and/or follow the internship). Concurrent courses, whether principally academic or professional in emphasis, are an area of weakness for programs that participated in our survey, however--only 25% of those who commented on methods of evaluation assess students on this basis. Jane Permaul, speaking on behalf of the National Society for Internships and Experiential Education, cautions, however, about the need to integrate the seminar with the work of the internship: "Too frequently [an] experiential learning course fails because the instructor uses his lecture notes and readings with total disregard [of] student field experiences. The course then becomes a regular course [with] an additional requirement."<28>

<28> Jane S. Permaul, "Policies and Practices for Quality Experiential Learning," a presentation delivered at a workshop sponsored by NSIEE at the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, January 8, 1981, in Denver, Colorado. The material quoted appears on p. 7 of the draft. Subsequent references appear in the text.

In a traditional course, quizzes, examinations and class discussions bring about student reflection on the learning experience. In internships, it is necessary to take special measures to activate student reflection on what has been learned and how it relates to learning in other parts of the curriculum. The degree to which students reflect on this less traditionally structured experience will very likely determine how much they benefit from it, intellectually and developmentally.

In addition to the opportunities for reflection on the internship afforded by a finely integrated concurrent seminar, there is the pre-internship orientation, a service offered by over half (54%) of those who reported providing internship services. In a pre-internship orientation, students are able to focus early on the kinds of learning they want to get from the internship and for which they will later by held accountable. In some cases, they may even receive early instruction in how to compose a learning contract, where questions of learning and accountability are spelled out.

Four fifths of those who discussed evaluation mechanisms indicated that they use journals or logs, another method of activating student reflection, although it has been observed that students often have difficulty maintaining an analytical edge to such informal writing. For this reason, some respondents find the assignment of short analytical papers or reports more effective for stimulating student reflection.

Additional opportunities for student reflection arise with the exit interview, during which the faculty sponsor reviews with the student the various evaluations of his or her work made throughout the internship. Almost half (43%) of those who commented on methods of evaluation use exit interviews. Because experiential learning requires students to be self-directed much of the time, however, one such session is not enough. It is important to build into the course a number of occasions when students can hear how faculty and intern sponsors see their progress. At their best, these ongoing evaluations train interns' powers of reflection back upon their own learning in the internship. Jane Permaul comments that ongoing evaluation "will provide . . . feedback to students and alert the instructor and supervisor [to] student progress. This mechanism should not be closely tied to grading [although] the actual learning gained in accordance [with] course objectives should be the basis for grades, as [it] would be in other courses" (p. 6).

Used least frequently to stimulate student reflection is an organized period of post-internship assessment, checked by only 1% of those who indicated the internship services they provide. The period after the internship is ideally one of the most fertile for reflection, and one that could bring great rewards to both the student and the program. The student has finished all work for the internship and is therefore in a better position than at any other time to reflect on what the experience has meant and what impact it may have on the rest of his or her course of study. The fact that a program requires a period of structured post-internship

assessment also serves as a sign of seriousness of purpose that may make the student regard his or her work for the internship more seriously and self-consciously. The internship program also stands to gain for its own prestige and recognition on campus. If post-internship assessments by students are compellingly favorable, it can only help the program make the case for experiential learning.

The effects of long-term post-internship assessment might also be dramatically beneficial to the program. The WICHE-CAEL Casebook notes: "Little is done to assess long-range effects [of internships]. Some studies have indicated that after a period of ten years the learning associated with internship experience becomes even more important" (p. 106). Internship programs that include such follow-up studies as part of their own self-evaluation efforts are apt to find themselves particularly well equipped to demonstrate program accountability, the fulfillment of goals they conceptualized for themselves in relation to the institutional curriculum.

APPENDIX A

Copies of Questionnaire A and B, preceded by the explanatory memoranda that accompanied them when they were sent to some 9,000 departments and campus offices nationwide, appear in the next few pages.

THE WASHINGTON CENTER
"EDUCATING THROUGH THE RESOURCES OF THE CAPITAL CITY"

1101 FOURTEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202/289-8680

November 29, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: DEPARTMENT CHAIRS IN ENGLISH, AMERICAN STUDIES, ART HISTORY, PHILOSOPHY, CLASSICS, AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

CK

FROM: DR. CARREN KASTON, PROJECT DIRECTOR, NEH GRANT, THE WASHINGTON CENTER

RE: *Survey of College-Level Internship Programs for Humanities Students*

The National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded The Washington Center a six-month grant to survey and analyze college-level internship programs for students in the humanities nationwide. Recognizing that humanities departments may differ widely in their attitudes toward the internship concept, the Center is seeking responses both from departments that do and departments that do not support undergraduate internships. For example, some departments may think that internships enrich the student curriculum, while others may think that internships take time away from students' concentration on the major.

To survey both of these groups, two questionnaires are being sent to humanities departments on your campus. Please fill out the pink *QUESTIONNAIRE A* if your department or division *DOES NOT* support the internship concept, either by sponsoring internships for its undergraduate majors *or* by giving them access to internships arranged through other academic departments, central internship offices on campus, or internship programs based off-campus. Your participation in the survey is very valuable in helping us learn more about the internship climate nationwide. Please note that *ad hoc* internship arrangements with individual faculty sponsors should be recorded on *QUESTIONNAIRE B.*

Please fill out the yellow *QUESTIONNAIRE B,* then, if your department or division *DOES* support the internship concept, either by sponsoring internships for its undergraduate majors *or* by giving them access to internships arranged through other academic departments, central internship offices on campus, or internship programs based off-campus.

A final report, based upon the information you provide in these questionnaires, will detail the extent to which humanities students have access to work-and-learning internships and the attitudes and practices that prevail in your field with respect to internships. A complimentary copy of the Executive Summary of the final report will be available to all survey participants. Simply indicate on the last page of your questionnaire if you would like to receive it.

PLEASE MAIL YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE BACK BY DECEMBER 22. Our postal permit for the first-class return mail envelopes runs out on December 31, and to stay on schedule with the grant, we must begin our analyses in mid-December. As a fellow faculty member, I realize that our December 22 deadline will coincide with end-of-term pressures for most of you. I would greatly appreciate it, however, if you could find a few moments during these busy days to answer our questions.

If you have any questions or problems, please do not hesitate to call me collect at (202) 289-8680. We are excited about the opportunity to survey the range of attitudes and practices affecting internships in the

— *over, please* — 100

humanities. Thank you very much for your assistance.

N.B.: For the purpose of this study, internships are defined as supervised, out-of-class learning experiences that include a substantial work component. The internship may be full-time for a term, or part-time with concurrent course work. While some internships may be paid, financial return is not their sole purpose, as it would be with a part-time job or College Work-Study.

• • • • •

The Washington Center is a non-profit educational organization in the nation's capital. Since 1975, over 6,000 students from 500 institutions and all major fields have benefited from the Center's internships, selected-topic seminars, housing and support services.

THE WASHINGTON CENTER
"EDUCATING THROUGH THE RESOURCES OF THE CAPITAL CITY"

1101 FOURTEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202/289-8680

November 29, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: OFFICES FOR EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING, INTERNSHIPS, COOPERATIVE EDUCATION AND CAREER SERVICES, AND INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS BASED OUTSIDE OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

FROM: DR. CARREN KASTON, PROJECT DIRECTOR, NEH GRANT, THE WASHINGTON CENTER

RE: *Survey of College-Level Internship Programs for Humanities Students*

The National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded The Washington Center a six-month grant to survey and analyze college-level internship programs for students in the humanities nationwide. In addition to studying the access to internships provided to humanities students through their departments, we wish to learn about non-departmental arrangements through which humanities majors can undertake internships. The enclosed *QUESTIONNAIRE B* is therefore being sent directly to department chairs in the humanities *and* to offices for experience-based learning and internships, both inside and outside of campus settings.

A final report, based upon the information you provide in these questionnaires, will detail the extent to which humanities students have access to work-and-learning internships and the attitudes and practices that prevail with respect to these internships. A complimentary copy of the Executive Summary of the final report will be available to all survey participants. Simply indicate on the last page of your questionnaire if you would like to receive it.

PLEASE MAIL YOUR QUESTIONNAIRE BACK BY DECEMBER 22. Our postal permit for the first-class return mail envelopes runs out on December 31, and to stay on schedule with the grant, we must begin our analyses in mid-December. As a colleague in experiential education, I realize that our December 22 deadline will coincide with end-of-term pressures for most of you. I would greatly appreciate it, however, if you could find a few moments during these busy days to answer our questions.

If you have any questions or problems, please do not hesitate to call me collect at (202) 289-8680. We are excited about the opportunity to survey the range of attitudes and practices affecting internships in the humanities. Thank you very much for your assistance.

N.B.: For the purpose of this study, internships are defined as supervised, out-of-class learning experiences that include a substantial work component. The internship may be full-time for a term, or part-time with concurrent course work. While some internships may be paid, financial return is not their sole purpose, as it would be with a part-time job or College Work-Study.

• • • • •

The Washington Center is a non-profit educational organization in the nation's capital. Since 1975, over 6,000 students from 500 institutions and all major fields have benefited from the Center's internships, selected-topic seminars, housing and support services.

THE WASHINGTON CENTER
"EDUCATING THROUGH THE RESOURCES OF THE CAPITAL CITY"

1101 FOURTEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202/289-8680

November 29, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO: CHIEF STUDENT AFFAIRS OFFICER

CK

FROM: DR. CARREN KASTON, PROJECT DIRECTOR, NEH GRANT, THE WASHINGTON CENTER

RE: *Survey of College-Level Internship Programs for Humanities Students*

The National Endowment for the Humanities has awarded The Washington Center a six-month grant to survey and analyze college-level internship programs for students in the humanities nationwide. In addition to studying the access to internships provided to humanities students through their departments, we wish to learn about non-departmental arrangements through which humanities majors can undertake internships. The enclosed *QUESTIONNAIRE B* is therefore being sent directly to department chairs in the humanities *and* to offices for experience-based learning and internships.

In order to be sure we have not missed any internship programs based outside of humanities departments, we are asking you to forward the enclosed memo and Questionnaire B to your campus' office of experiential learning, internships, cooperative education, career services, or the like. If there is more than one such office on campus, we would greatly appreciate your making as many copies as necessary of the enclosed material and forwarding them.

I might note that the deadline for mailing the questionnaire back is *DECEMBER 22.* Our postal permit for the first-class return mail envelopes runs out on December 31, and to stay on schedule with the grant, we must begin our analyses in mid-December. I realize that the December 22 deadline will coincide with end-of-term pressures for most of you, but I would greatly appreciate your help in distributing the questionnaire to the proper offices as soon as possible.

To help you decide to whom to forward the enclosed material, it may be useful for me to specify that for the purposes of this study, internships are defined as supervised, out-of-class learning experiences that include a substantial work component. The internship may be full-time for a term, or part-time with concurrent course work. While some internships may be paid, financial return is not their sole purpose, as it would be with a part-time job or College Work-Study.

If you have any questions or problems, please do not hesitate to call me collect at (202) 289-8680. We are excited about the opportunity to survey the range of attitudes and practices affecting internships in the humanities. Thank you very much for your assistance.

• • • • •

The Washington Center is a non-profit educational organization in the nation's capital. Since 1975, over 6,000 students from 500 institutions and all major fields have benefited from the Center's internships, selected-topic seminars, housing and support services.

* * * QUESTIONNAIRE A * * *

Questionnaire A is designed for departments in the humanities that DO NOT provide their undergraduate majors with access to internship experiences, either through the department or through other mechanisms. "Access" includes credit in the major for internship work arranged elsewhere and any kind of *ad hoc* curriculum arrangement with individual faculty members. If your department does not provide access of this or any other kind, please help us learn more about instructional attitudes and practices in your field by answering the following questions and mailing the questionnaire back by DECEMBER 22 in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope to Dr. Carren Kaston, Project Director, NEH Grant, The Washington Center, 1101 14th Street, N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Please be assured that responses will not be identified with particular institutions; results will be reported only in the aggregate.

1. Name and title of respondent _____

   Institution _____

   Department _____

   Address _____

   _____ Zip Code _____

   Telephone (_____) _____

   Public institution _____; Private institution _____

   Size of undergraduate student body:

   _____ Under 1,000 _____ 2,500-5,000 _____ Over 10,000
   _____ 1,000-2,500 _____ 5,000-10,000

2. How many undergraduate majors are enrolled in your department? _____

3. Check here if your department offers the B.A. only _____; the M.A. _____; the Ph.D. _____.

4. Please indicate the reason(s) why your department does not provide internship experiences or access to such experiences to your undergraduate majors. Some reasons that have been advanced appear below. Check those that apply in your department and mark the most important with a "1."

   _____ Detracts from course work.
   _____ Weakens liberal arts orientation.
   _____ Too many requirements already.
   _____ Too costly.
   _____ Difficult to insure quality of internship experience.
   _____ There has been no student interest.
   _____ The school administration does not support such efforts.
   _____ Faculty have not expressed an interest.
   _____ Inadequate number of faculty or staff to run the program.
   _____ Faculty would not get released time or other compensation.
   _____ Geographic limitations: few internship opportunities available locally.
   _____ Concern that employers are looking for "cheap labor."
   _____ Other: _____

5. Do your undergraduate majors participate in internships arranged outside of the department? Yes _____; No _____; I don't know _____.

6. If so, who coordinates them? (Check all items that apply.)

_____ Other academic departments.
_____ Central internship office on campus (e.g., experiential learning program, career services office, cooperative education office).
_____ Study abroad. (Check here only if the study abroad incorporates a substantial work component.)
_____ Internship programs or organizations based outside of the school (e.g., The Great Lakes College Association or The Washington Center).
_____ Other: _____

Please help us in our data-collection by forwarding *Questionnaire B* to the office(s) above that coordinate non-departmental internships for your majors.

7. How many of your undergraduate majors typically participate each year in internships arranged through such mechanisms? _____

8. What type of academic requirements, the major excluded, can be satisfied by internship experience? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ None.
_____ General Education credit.
_____ Elective credit.
_____ Graduation.
_____ Other: _____

9. Have any of your current students expressed an interest in having department-based internships or access to internships through the department? Yes _____; No _____.

10. If so, what is the basis of their interest?

11. Are faculty members in your department now interested in offering majors department-based internships or access to internships? Yes _____; No _____.

12. If so, what is the basis of their interest?

13. Is your institution currently taking steps to provide internships for humanities students? Yes _____; No _____.

14. If so, what is the basis of that action?

15. Additional comments:

PLEASE MAIL THIS QUESTIONNAIRE BACK BY DECEMBER 22 to Dr. Carren Kaston, Project Director, NEH Grant, The Washington Center, 1101 14th Street, N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005. *Thank you for participating in the survey.*

Check here if you wish to receive the Executive Summary of the report generated by the findings of the study _____.

* * * QUESTIONNAIRE B * * *

Questionnaire B is designed for departments or divisions in the humanities that provide their undergraduate majors with access to internship experiences, either through the department or through other mechanisms. (Study abroad should not be counted as an internship experience unless it incorporates a substantial work component.)

Please mail the questionnaire back by DECEMBER 22 in the enclosed, stamped, self-addressed envelope to Dr. Carren Kaston, Project Director, NEH Grant, The Washington Center, 1101 14th Street. N.W., 12th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005.

Please be assured that responses will not be identified with particular institutions; results will be reported only in the aggregate.

1. Institution _____

   Department/Office _____

   Address _____

   _____ Zip Code _____

   Contact person (name and title) _____

   Telephone (_____) _____

   Public institution _____; Private institution _____

   Size of undergraduate student body:

   _____ Under 1,000 _____ 2,500-5,000 _____ Over 10,000

   _____ 1,000-2,500 _____ 5,000-10,000

2. Check here if your department offers the B.A. only _____; the M.A. _____; the Ph.D. _____

3. Check all the entries below that describe the ways in which your department provides access to internships for your undergraduate majors.

   _____ Through the department.
   Primary responsibility (check one):
   - _____ Department chair
   - _____ Department's administrative staff
   - _____ Graduate students
   - _____ Individual faculty members in *ad hoc* arrangements with students
   - _____ Faculty-coordinated departmental program

   _____ Through other academic departments.

   _____ Through central internship office on campus (e.g., experiential learning program, career services office, cooperative education office).

   _____ Through internship programs or organizations based outside of the school (e.g., The Great Lakes College Association or The Washington Center).

   _____ Other: _____

Answer EITHER 4 *or* 5. THEN PROCEED TO 6.

4. *To be answered by departments:*

   a) How many undergraduates are enrolled this year? _____

   b) How many participate in internships arranged through the department? _____

   c) How many participate in internships arranged through central offices on campus or organizations based off-campus? _____ Name of program? _____

5. *To be answered by internship programs based outside of academic departments*, whether in a central office on campus or an organization off-campus:

a) How many undergraduates do you typically serve each year? _____
b) How many of them are humanities students _____
c) How many of them major in the following areas?

_____ English
_____ American Studies
_____ History
_____ Art History
_____ Philosophy
_____ Classics
_____ Modern foreign languages (please specify):
_____ _____
_____ _____
_____ _____

NOTE TO INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS BASED OUTSIDE OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS: Please answer all subsequent questions *as they pertain to humanities undergraduate interns only.*

6. Since when have humanities majors had access to internships? 19 __ __

7. What factors played a role in your decision to offer students access to internships? (Check all items that apply and mark the most important with a "1".)

_____ Student interest.
_____ Faculty interest.
_____ Suggestion by president, dean, or other administrators.
_____ Suggestion arising from institutional review or self-study.
_____ Desire to retain majors.
_____ Employers in area began requesting student interns.
_____ Change in educational philosophy: _____
_____ Other: _____

8. What is the source of your present funding? (Check all items that apply.)

_____ No funds specifically allocated.
_____ Institutional funds.
_____ Departmental funds.
_____ Corporate grants.
_____ Federal grant.
_____ Other: _____

9. What do you see as the purpose of internships for humanities students? (Check all items that apply and mark the most important with a "1".)

_____ Acquisition of academic content.
_____ Integration of academic theory with practical application.
_____ Career exploration.
_____ Acquisition of general work experience.
_____ Development of specific work skills.
_____ General maturation of student (e.g., sense of responsibility, interpersonal skills, clarification of values).
_____ Other: _____

10. In your experience, are humanities students who have had internships more successful at obtaining employment after graduation? Yes ____; No ____. Comment: _____

11. What are the prerequisites for participation in the internship? (Check all items that apply.)

_____ No prerequisites.
_____ Minimum grade-point average of _____ in a _____ point grading system.
_____ Class year: Fr. _____; Soph. _____; Jr. _____; Sr. _____.
_____ Minimum number of credits in the major.
_____ Preparatory course.
_____ Other: _____

12. What percentage of students taking internships are placed

Locally? _____ % Throughout the nation? _____ %
In the state? _____ % Internationally? _____ %

13. What percentage of them secure placement in

Business? _____ %; Non-profit agencies or institutions? _____ %; Government? _____ %.

14. Are students required to find their own placements? Yes ____; No ____.

15. How many hours weekly do your humanities interns typically work? _____

16. What percentage of them, if any, typically receive a stipend or salary? _____ %

17. What extra fees, if any, do students pay to participate in internships? $ _____

18. Are formal learning plans or contracts required of each intern? Yes ____; No ____.

19. Indicate which mechanisms are used to evaluate student performance. (Check all items that apply.)

_____ Journals, logs, progress reports.
_____ Oral reports.
_____ Term papers.
_____ Participation in courses conducted concurrently with the internship.
_____ Written examinations.
_____ On-site supervisors' comments and written evaluations.
_____ Site visits and/or telephone calls to intern by faculty.
_____ Evaluation of learning plans or contracts.
_____ Exit interviews.
_____ Other: _____

20. What evaluation system is used to assess the student's internship experience?

Grades A through F ____; Pass/Fail ____; No grades given ____; Other: _____

21. What percentage of your interns typically take an "Incomplete" each year _____ %

Comment: _____

22. What academic requirements can be satisfied by internship experience? (Check as many as apply.)

_____ None.
_____ General Education credit.
_____ Elective credit.
_____ Credit in major.
_____ Graduation.
_____ Other: _____

23. If credit is given, what is the average amount of credit awarded to students in one semester? _____; or in one quarter? _____.

24. What internship services do you provide? (Check all items that apply.)

_____ Counseling of students interested in internships.
_____ Recruiting and/or screening of students.
_____ Identification and certification of work sites.
_____ Assistance to students in securing placements.
_____ Pre-internship orientation.
_____ Supervision during internship.
_____ Concurrent seminar.
_____ Evaluation of student at end of internship.
_____ Organized period of post-internship assessment by students.
_____ Other: _____

25. What compensation is given for administering internships?

_____ No compensation. _____ Course load credit.
_____ Extra salary. _____ Service credit.
_____ Released time. _____ Other: _____

26. Is administration of internships given consideration in promotion? _____; tenure? _____; or merit pay evaluations? _____.

27. Is special training and/or work experience required of faculty or staff who administer the internships?

_____ Yes: _____
_____ No.

28. Is finding high-quality internship placements for humanities undergraduates easy? _____ or difficult? _____.

29. What, in your opinion, constitutes a high-quality internship experience?

PLEASE DISCUSS BRIEFLY THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS. (If necessary, use an extra sheet for your answers, and number each response.)

30. What has made your department's experience with internships a successful one?

31. What difficulties have you encountered in sponsoring or providing students with access to internships?

32. Please discuss briefly what you see as the major internship issues affecting undergraduate humanities students.

If you have descriptive materials for your program, please send them to us when returning the questionnaire.

MAIL THE QUESTIONNAIRE BACK BY DECEMBER 22 to Dr. Carren Kaston, Project Director, NEH Grant, The Washington Center, 1101 14th Street, 12th Floor, Washington, D.C., 20005. *Thank you for participating in the survey.*

Check here if you wish to receive the Executive Summary of the report generated by the findings of the study _____.

APPENDIX B

Within the group of modern foreign languages, a further breakdown shows that, except for Spanish, most language departments in our sample have little involvement in internship activity.

MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES: FREQUENCY OF "A's" and "B's" IN SAMPLE n=339

Language Department	A (No)	B (Yes)	Number of Usable Returns (A and B)
Languages and Literature	9 (36%)	16 (64%)	25
Modern Foreign Languages	123 (68%)	58 (32%)	181
Romance Languages	20 (77%)	6 (23%)	26
Spanish (or Spanish and Portuguese)	11 (58%)	8 (42%)	19
Portuguese	-0-	-0-	-0-
French	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	9
Italian	3 (75%)	1 (25%)	4
German	23 (74%)	8 (26%)	31
Russian/Slavic Languages	14 (70%)	6 (30%)	20
East Asian Languages	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	10
Japanese	-0-	-0-	-0-
Chinese	-0-	-0-	-0-
Classical and any modern foreign language(s)	10 (71%)	4 (29%)	14

Departments of Language(s) and Literature combine the study of English and foreign languages, either modern or classical, presumably an adaptation at schools that do not have enough foreign language students to justify separate language departments.

Departments of Modern Foreign Languages combine the study of several foreign languages, either unspecified or in unpredictable combinations (e.g., German and Russian).